An
Introduction to
THE EMENDATION
of
A Shī'ite Creed

An Introduction to THE EMENDATION of *A Shī‘ite Creed*

An Introduction to the Book
Taṣḥīḥu 'l-I‘tiqãd of
Abū ‘Abdillãh, Muḥammad ibn
Muḥammad ibn Nu‘mãn,
Known as ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd.
(336/948 or 338/950 – 413/1022)
by:

Muḥammad Riḍã Ja‘farī

Volume I

WOFIS
World Organization for Islamic Services
Tehran – Iran.

Translated from the original Arabic
First edition 1426/2006

E-mail: wofis@wofis.com
http: //www.wofis.com

Translated and Published by:
World Organization for Islamic Services,
P.O.Box 11365-1545,
Tehran – 15837,
ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN.

In the Name of Allãh
The All-Compassionate, The All-Merciful

Praise belongs to Allãh, the Lord of all Being;
the All-Compassionate, the All-Merciful;
the Master of the Day of Judgement.
Thee only we serve; and to Thee alone we pray for succour.
Guide us in the straight path,
the path of those whom Thou hast blessed,
not of those against whom Thou art wrathful,
nor of those who are astray.

* * * * *

O' Allãh! Send your blessings to the head of your messengers and the last of your prophets,
Muḥammad and his pure and cleansed progeny.
Also send your blessings to all your prophets and envoys.

بِسْمِ اللهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِيمِ
اَلْحَمْدُ لِلّٰهِ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ ۝ اَلرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِيمِ
مَالِكِ يَوْمِ الدِّينِ ۝ إِيَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ وَإِيَّاكَ نَسْتَعِينُ
اِهْدِنَا الصِّرَاطَ الْمُسْتَقِيمَ ۝ صِرَاطَ الَّذِينَ
أَنْعَمْتَ عَلَيْهِمْ ۝ غَيْرِ الْمَغْضُوبِ عَلَيْهِمْ
وَلَا الضَّالِّينَ

اَللّٰهُمَّ صَلِّ عَلَىٰ
سَيِّدِ رُسُلِكَ وَخَاتَمِ أَنْبِيَائِكَ
مُحَمَّدٍ وَآلِهِ الطَّيِّبِينَ الطَّاهِرِينَ
وَصَلِّ عَلَىٰ جَمِيعِ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ وَالْمُرْسَلِينَ

CONTENTS

* * * * *

TRANSLITERATION

Ar. Letters	Transliteration
ء	'
ا	a
ب	b
ت	t
ث	th
ج	j
ح	ḥ
خ	kh
د	d
ذ	dh
ر	r
ز	z
س	s
ش	sh
ص	ṣ
ض	ḍ
ط	ṭ
ظ	ẓ
ع	'
غ	gh
ف	f

Ar. Letters	Transliteration
ق	q
ك	k
ل	l
م	m
ن	n
و	w
ه	h
ي	y
ة	ah

Short Vowel

ـَ	a
ـِ (or إِ)	i
ـُ	u

Long Vowels

آ	ã
ي	ī
و	ū

مقدمة الناشر

و الحمد لله الّذي وفّقنا لنشر (تصحيح الإعتقاد) للشيخ المفيد بعد أن وفّقنا من قبل لنشر (اعتقادات الإماميّة) للشيخ الصدوق، رضي الله عنهما و عن جميع العاملين لنشر الاسلام وخدمة المسلمين.

وكانت الترجمة الإنجليزية لتصحيح الإعتقاد قد أُحيلت إلينا منذ زمن، وكان الاستاذ المترجم قد أعدّها أُطروحة جامعيّة، و قسّمها الى ثلاثة اقسام، القسم الاوّل ترجمة للمفيد, و الثاني ترجمة نص الكتاب, و الثالث التعاليق و الهوامش التي علّقها المترجم على بحوث الكتاب. وكان هذا القسم الأخير لايتّفق كل ما جاء فيه و الهدف الّذي وضعناه لأنفسنا في أعمالنا، و لا مع المقاييس الّتي نختار بها ما ننشر، فاكتفينا بنشر القسمين الأولين فحسب.

ولكنّ أحد المسئولين قد وضع مقدّمة للكتاب تلافي فيها ما كان يؤدّي اليه حذف القسم الثالث من خسارة فوضعناها كمدخل للكتاب.

و من الله نسأل و اليه نبتهل أن يجعل عملنا خالصاً لوجهه الكريم، وأن يسدّد خطانا، وأن يوفّقنا لما فيه رضىً له و لرسوله الكريم و آله الاكرمين, صلوات الله و سلامه عليهم أجمعين، إنّه نعم المولى و نعم النّصير.

المؤسسة العالميّة للخدمات الاسلاميّة

(لجنة التأليف و الترجمة و النشر) ١٤٢٦/٦/٢٠

طهران – ايران ٢٠٠٥/٧/٢٧

PUBLISHER'S FOREWORD

Praise be to Allãh through Whom we have succeeded in publishing *Taṣḥīḥu 'l-i'tiqãd* ["The Emendation of A Shī'ite Creed"] by the Shaykh al-Mufīd, after having succeeded, through Him, in publishing *I'tiqãdãtu 'l-Imãmiyyah* ["A Shī'ite Creed"] by the Shaykh aṣ-Ṣadūq, may Allãh be pleased with both of them and with all those who work for the spread of Islam and in the service of Muslims.

The English translation of *Taṣḥīḥu 'l-i'tiqãd* has been with us for some time, the translator having prepared it as part of his university thesis which consisted of three parts: a biography of al-Mufīd, the translation of the text of the book, and a section of commentary and notes which the translator attached to the sections of the book. Since the contents of this final section were somewhat inconsistent and not in keeping with the aims we have set ourselves in our work, nor with the standards we have set for our publications, we have been content to print only the first two parts.

However, one of our colleagues has written a preface to the book, which redresses the errors, which were responsible for the shortcomings of the third section, and we have included this as an introduction to the text.

We beseech and implore Allãh that He may, of His abundant generosity, make our effort free from errors, and enable us to attain His approval and that of His Prophet and his most noble Family, may the blessings and peace of Allãh be upon them all. Verily He is the perfect Master, the most excellent Protector.

WORLD ORGANIZATION FOR ISLAMIC SERVICES,
(Writing, Translation, and Publication Board),
Tehran, Iran.

20/6/1426
27/7/2005

An Introduction to THE EMENDATION of *A Shī‘ite Creed*

1
A BRIEF BIOGRAPHY OF AL-MUFIĪD

Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad an-Nu‘mãn ash-Shaykh Abū ‘Abdillãh al-Mufīd, Ibnu 'l-Mu‘allim, al-‘Ukbarī al-Baghdãdī (336/948–413/1022) was the teacher of the Shaykhu 'ṭ-Ṭãifah, Abū Ja‘far aṭ-Ṭūsī, who said of him:

> The leadership of the Imãmiyyah in his own time devolved upon him; he was foremost in the science and practice of dialectical theology (*kalãm*), a foremost jurist (*faqīh*), and an energetic thinker with an astute mind, always ready to answer . . .[1]

Three centuries after al-Mufīd, the ‘Allãmah al-Ḥillī (648/1250–726/1325), one of the most well-known and learned of the scholars of the Imãmiyyah, said this about him:

> [He was] one of the most outstanding *shaykh*s of the Shī‘ah, their leader and their teacher, and all those who came after him relied on him. His pre-eminence in law (*fiqh*), theology, and the narration of Tradition (*riwãyah*) is too well known to require description. [He was] the most reliable and learned of his contemporaries, and the leadership of the Imãmiyyah in his time devolved upon

[1] *al-Fihrist*, p.186.

> him; he was an energetic thinker with an astute mind, always ready to answer . . .[2]

In the introduction to the *Kitãbu 't-Tawḥīd* from the *Uṣūlu 'l-Kãfī* I gave a selection from the biographies which Imãmī scholars of theology wrote of the Shaykh al-Mufīd, may Allãh be pleased with him, and pointed out his particular theological position, his teachers in theology, and his works in that subject.

Professor ‘Irfãn ‘Abdu 'l-Ḥamīd, the translator of *Taṣḥīḥu 'l-i‘tiqãd* has likewise given, as part of his introduction, a biography of al-Mufīd in which he reviews the political life and events of the Shaykh's times, describing the political and sectarian struggle and its complications. Both the adverse and painful effects it had on al-Mufīd, as well as the benefit he derived from it, are covered. This is the approach taken here in writing about al-Mufīd, lest accusations of sectarianism be levelled by the likes of those who delight in the power of the sword when it falls on the necks of others, but are troubled when the wails and cries of the condemned disturb their own repose, and are even more purturbed when these groans and tragedies are recorded and documented, while they themselves remain unaffected by them.

For this reason apologies should be given in advance to our noble Sunnī and Shī‘ī brethren in case they come across anything which may offend them in Professor ‘Irfãn's book; for none of us, praise be to Allãh, have had anything to do with these misfortunes. We ask nothing more of Allãh than that He bestow a beneficial life of brotherhood on all Muslims, so that those who come to write the history of our own times will not have to describe it in the same way as the history of that previous age.

There are, however, in what Professor ‘Irfãn mentions some defects which it will do no harm to point out. What we cite here will suffice to explain our criticisms.

---

[2] *Khulãṣatu '1-aqwãl*, p.147.

2
SOME COMMENTS ON PROFESSOR ‘IRFÃN'S INTRODUCTION

a

Professor ‘Irfãn says[3] that the Shaykh al-Mufid 'was proud of his purely (*aṣ-ṣarīḥ*) Arab ancestry.'

He does not give any source for this statement, but what may have led him to this conclusion about al-Mufīd was the discovery he made about the latter's ancestry in an-Najãshī[4] who traces al-Mufīd's lineage back to Ya‘rūb ibn Qaḥṭãn. Now this was the kind of activity in which an-Najãshī revelled as a result of his meticulous concern for genealogies. He wrote a work on the science of genealogy, which he mentioned when he gave his own biography in his *Fihrist*.[5] His concern for line-age is also apparent in many of the biographies, which he included, and the ancestries of his subjects will be found traced back to the original tribes from which their clans arose.[6]

Apart from an-Najãshī, others, such as the Shaykhu 'ṭ-Ṭãifah aṭ-Ṭūsī in his *al-Fihrist* and *ar-Rijãl*, wrote biographies of these people, but they lack the chains of ancestry which an-Najãshī mentions.

Our Shaykh al-Mufīd – in common with other Muslim scholars and jurists, and even with the devout among the Muslims who are not scholars or jurists – was more excellent in his faith, knowledge, and understanding of the Islamic *sharī‘ah*, and nobler in character than that he should console himself by comparison with the pre-Islamic period, or boast about what Allãh and His Prophet, may Allãh bless him and his Family and

---

[3] *The Emendationof A Shī‘ite Creed,* Intro., p.3.
[4] *al-Fihrist* (Bombay, 1317), p.283-4.
[5] *Ibid.*, p.74.
[6] See *ibid.*, pp.7, 16, 59, 77, 90, 93, 97, 125, 145, 158-9, 162, 190, 202, 281- 2, 297-8, and 305.

grant them peace, had kept the believers away from: they had been warned not to boast of it, nor even to rely on it. The Messenger of Allãh said in the famous sermon, which he delivered in Mekkah when Allãh granted him victory over it, when He had fulfilled His promise, had strengthened His army, and had alone put the polytheists to flight:

> 'O people, verily Allãh has taken from you the haughtiness of pre-Islam (*al-jãhiliyyah*) and its boasting of ancestors and clans. Men are of two [kinds]: [those who are] pious, God-fearing, enobled before Allãh, and [those who are] sinful, wretched, insignificant before Allãh . . . Man springs from Ãdam, and Allãh created Adam from dust. Being Arab does not mean [having] parentage from a [single] father, it means [having] an eloquent language, and one who was unable to speak it was not counted as one of them.' Then he recited Allãh's words: '*O people! We created you from male and female, and made you into peoples and tribes that you might know one another. Truly, the most noble of you in Allãh's sight is the most God-fearing. Verily, Allãh is All-knowing, All-wise'* (al-Ḥujarãt, 49:13).[7]

I have not come across any source in which al-Mufid himself cites, or refers to, this lineage of his, nor one in which he mentions, or refers to, an Arab tribe to which he belongs.

b

Professor ‘Irfãn states[8]: 'Among those who wrote elegies on [al-

---

[7] al-Kulaynī, *al-Kãfī*, vol.8, p.246; al-Ḥusayn ibn Sa‘īd, *al-Mu'min*, p.56; al-Majlisī, *al-Biḥãr*, vol.21, pp.137, 138; vol.73, p.293; at-Tirmidhī, *aṣ-Ṣaḥīḥ*, vol.5, pp.389, 734, 735; Abū Dãwūd, *as-Sunan*, vol.4, p.331; Aḥmad, *al-Musnad*, vol.2, pp.361, 523-4; Ibn Hishãm, *as-Sīrah*, vol.4, pp.54-55; al-Wãqidī, *al-Maghãzī*, vol.2, pp.835-7; Ibn Sa‘d, *aṭ-Ṭabaqãt*, vol.2 pt.1, p.103; aṭ-Ṭabarī, *at-Tãrīkh*, vol.1, p1642.

[8] *The Emendation of A Shī‘ite* Creed, Intro., p.4.

Mufīd] was his pupil, the Sharīf ar-Raḍī.' This can only be a slip or an unintended mistake. The Sharīf ar-Raḍī died in the year 406/1015, two years before the death of his teacher, al-Mufīd. The one who elegized him was another of his students, ar-Raḍī's brother, the Sharīf al-Murtaḍã, who died in 436/1044, who elegized him with a *qaṣīdah* rhyming in *mīm* of thirty-three verses.[9]

3
THE EXTENT OF AL-MUFĪD'S RELATIONS WITH AṢ-ṢADŪQ

This book, *Taṣḥīḥu 'l-i‘tiqãd*, is a commentary on the book *I‘tiqãdãtu 'l-Imãmiyyah*, written by aṣ-Ṣadūq, the Shaykh Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, Ibn Bãbawayh, al-Qummī (*c* 306/919–381/991). In this book, the Shaykh al-Mufīd comments on the places in which he disagrees with what aṣ-Ṣadūq said, either in matters of independent reasoning, or concerning the evidence upon which aṣ-Ṣadūq relies, or on the grounds of the nature of the argumentation where they agree upon the evidence. Some discussion of this aspect will follow.

As for the connection between al-Mufīd and aṣ-Ṣadūq, aṣ-Ṣadūq was one of those with whom al-Mufīd studied in the early years of his life when he was not yet twenty years old. al-Mufīd studied with him when aṣ-Ṣadūq was in Baghdad, and heard Traditions from him. He received his authorization (*ijãzah*) to transmit his writings and his narrations of Traditions; thus aṣ-Ṣadūq was one of al-Mufīd's mentors in Traditions. I believe that the duration of this relationship was short for the following reason.

aṣ-Ṣadūq was born and raised in Qum and then emigrated to

---

9 *Dīwãnu 'l-Murtaḍã*, vol.3, pp.204-6.

Rayy, where he resided until he died. He travelled in search of Traditions and other material, and made a journey to Iraq on his way to the *ḥajj*. aṣ-Ṣadūq himself mentions that he came to Baghdad on his way to the *ḥajj* in the year 352/963.[10] It appears that he came to Baghdad towards the end of that year, because he left Rayy on a pilgrimage to Mashhad (of ar-Riḍã, peace be upon him) in the middle of that year.[11] His *ḥajj* was in the following year, 353/964, so he must have left Baghdad in the middle of the year, considering the conditions of travel in those days, and the time, which it would have taken him to cover the distance and carry out the rites of the *ḥajj*. What indicates this chronology of events is that aṣ-Ṣadūq mentions that he was in Fayd (a town half-way between Kūfah and Makkah)[12] in 354/965 after completing the *ḥajj* to the House of Allãh,[13] and that he reached Kūfah in the middle of that year.[14] In the same year, on his way back from Madīnah, he was in Hamadãn, in Iran, relatively near to his home-town of Rayy if considered in relation to Kūfah.[15] It is inconceivable that he should have performed the *ḥajj* in the same year, 354/965, in which he was in Fayd on his return, then in Kūfah and later in Hamadãn. The *ḥajj* only occurs in the last month of the lunar year, and in the light of all this it can be concluded that aṣ-Ṣadūq could only have stayed in Baghdad a few months, not a complete year, and that these months were at the end of 352/ 963 and at the beginning of the following year. One therefore has to disagree

---

[10] *'Uyūnu 'l-akhbãr*, vol.1, pp.59 & 279; *Kamãlu 'd-dīn*, vol.1, pp.93, & 277.

[11] *'Uyūnu 'l-akhbãr*, vol.1, pp.14, 99, 118, 178, 209; vol.2, pp.99, 121, 238, & 279; *Ma'ãni 'l-akhbãr*, p.145; *at-Tawḥīd*, p.406.

[12] *Mu'jamu 'l-buldãn*, vol.4, p.282.

[13] *'Uyūnu 'l-akhbãr*, vol.2, p.57.

[14] *Ibid.*, vol.1, pp.81, 129, 138, 144, 249-50, & 262; *al-Amãlī*, vol.2, pp.13, 65, 93, and many other places; *al-Khiṣãl*, vol.1, pp.46, 57, 83; vol.2, pp.13, 65, & 93.

[15] *al-Khiṣãl*, vol.1, pp.106, 295 & 320; *at-Tawḥīd*, p.77.

with what an-Najãshī states about aṣ-Ṣadūq reaching Baghdad in 355/966[16] – and all those who dated his entering Baghdad to that year took this from him – because this would necessarily mean either that he returned there from Hamadãn, where he was in 354/965, when he was half-way back to Rayy, or that he headed back to Baghdad a second time after reaching Rayy, and that would seem to be very far-fetched.

Whatever may have happened, the Shaykh aṣ-Ṣadūq reached Baghdad, narrated, and also heard, Traditions there. The Imãmī *shaykh*s studied with him, according to an-Najãshī, and among them was the Shaykh al-Mufīd. Naturally, in such a short time his lectures could not have included all his books and narrations, and most of them must have been narrations by proxy, not his own lectures in the strict sense of the word.

The relationship between these two men – according to what I have mentioned – was not a master/pupil relationship, in the strict sense of these terms, such that aṣ-Ṣadūq can be counted, as he is by Professor 'Irfãn in the introduction to this translation, as one of al-Mufīd's teachers. It is accurate to distinguish in this discussion between being a teacher's student and acquiring Traditions from a *shaykh*. In the strict sense, al-Mufīd had only four teachers who were scholars of theology, and these were enumerated in my earlier biography of him; and in the legal sciences such as (*fiqh*), and *ḥadīth* there was a single teacher, with whom al-Mufīd studied for many years and 'from whom he acquired what he knew', as his biographers state, and this was the Shaykh Abu 'l-Qãsim Ja'far ibn Muḥammad ibn Ja'far Mūsã, Ibn Qūlawayh, al-Qummī, later al-Baghdãdī (*c* 282/898–368/979). When al-Mufīd died, he was buried beside the grave of his teacher in the holy shrine at Kãẓimayn [Iraq].

16 *al-Fihrist*, (Bombay, 1317), p.276.

4
DIFFERENCES IN HOW IDEAS ARE ARGUED DO NOT REFLECT DIFFERENCES IN THE IDEAS THEMSELVES

Before we enter the main part of the discussion of the dogmatics of the Imãmīs and their two schools of Tradition and theology, a fact of the utmost importance must be stated right at the beginning, one which it would be an error to leave unnoticed or ignored, which is that it is necessary to distinguish between a given belief as such and the demonstration of that belief and how it is attained. Opinion can concur on one of the principal dogmas while the demonstrations which establish that principle can differ. For example, unicity (*tawḥīd*) is the most important principal dogma of Islam, and no Muslim can be counted as such unless he acknowledges it and those attributes of the Creator or the aspects of His Oneness which establish the necessity of belief. However, there are differences in the way in which unicity and the attestation of the Creator are sum-marily demonstrated, or in which their details are elaborated. These demonstrations can depend on the Holy Qur'ãn and the *Sunnah*, or they can depend on intellectual proofs. This differ-ence in the kind of proof, or in the nature of the demonstration, be it right or wrong, does not necessarily mean there is a difference in the dogma itself.

It would be possible to give dozens of examples of this. The Imãmate, according to the meaning of it in which the Imãmīs believe, by which they are distinguished from other Muslim sects, is a dogma which all the Imãmīs share. In its very nature it is a matter, which depends on transmission, i.e., the Qur'ãn and the *Sunnah*, but there are serious differences in its demonstration, and between one scholar and another there can be total disagreement. We may find one scholar exclusively citing Qur'ãnic verses and Traditions, while another, who cites, alongside what

is called 'transmitted proofs', intellectual proofs, within the limits within which this kind of discussion is bound by intellectual proofs and their particular domain. If the well known debates of, the famous Imãmī theologian, on the Imãmate are referred to,[17] a great difference will be found between him and many who gave theological arguments for the Imãmate, whether they were contemporary with him or came after him. It is not only that Hishãm quoted Traditions without discussion and opinion, explanation and commentary, but frequently he did not quote a specific Tradition verbatim and referred only to the meaning and recited its contents as if it were he who were saying it.

One of the clearest examples of what is being discussed can be found in the difference between *Iʻtiqãdãtu 'l-Imãmiyyah* by our Shaykh aṣ-Ṣadūq, and *Taṣḥīḥu 'l-iʻtiqãd* by our Shaykh al-Mufīd, as will be shown. Moreover, a single author, such as al-Mufīd, differs in the kind of discussion he uses from one place to another. A good example occurs in the introduction which al-Mufīd wrote for the *Kitãbu 'l-Irshãd*, in one part of which he employed the style of *ḥadīth* quotation, and in another the style of dialectical theology; and yet both sections are concerned with exactly the same topic. This is not to say that the Imãmiy-yah differed on the subject of the Imãmate itself, or its meaning and special characteristics; however, it is correct for us to distinguish between two schools among them: that of Tradition, and that of dialectical theology. Moreover, it is the case that their approaches differed with respect to the study of the Imãmate.

For a precise examination, which does not jump to conclusions on the basis of those instances in which we initially find difference and disagreement in the substance of the two approaches, we must carefully consider the effect these methods

[17] See, e.g., *al-Kãfī*, vol.l, pp.171-3; al-Kishshī, pp.258-63; *Kamãlu 'd-dīn*, vol.20, pp.362-8; *al-Khiṣãl*, vol.1, p.215; *Majmaʻu 'r-rijãl*, vol.6, pp.218-21; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.48, pp.189-93, 197-203.

had upon the fundamental conclusions which their adherents arrived at, and then weigh the results one against the other not the methods utilised to reach these results. In the light of this, we can then conclude whether there really was a difference in opinion or belief; otherwise, the consideration of mere methodological differences will lead to erroneous assumptions about differences in the principle of the belief, which each method supports or refutes.

5
THOSE BELIEFS WHICH ARE INCUMBENT ON BELIEVERS AND THOSE WHICH ARE NOT

It is now necessary to turn our attention to what the Shaykh aṣ-Ṣadūq states in *I‘tiqãdãtu 'l-Imãmiyyah*, to the additions the Shaykh al-Mufīd makes in *Taṣḥīḥu 'l-i‘tiqãd*, and to what they both say, in general, about the beliefs of the Imãmiyyah. What follows divides itself into two sections, something which is not specific to the beliefs of the Imãmiyyah alone, but is in fact generally the case with Muslim dogmatics; nevertheless, we shall restrict our discussion to the Imãmiyyah.

a

The beliefs, which true faith, requires of every responsible individual **(mukallaf):** A Muslim cannot be considered one of the Imãmiyyah unless he maintains all of these. No one of them is excused for not knowing them, and, because of that, the ignorant person has to attain knowledge in such a way that he can learn proofs and ways of thinking so that the true faith is produced in him through knowledge and peace of mind. The five dogmatic principles are, in brief: Unicity (*tawḥīd*), i.e. that Allãh, Eternal, All-Powerful, and All-Wise, is alone the Creator, and is alone to be worshipped, without associates in either

creation or worship; Justice (*'adl*), meaning that Allãh, praise be upon Him, does not oppress or persecute, not because he is unable to do so, but rather because His essence is divine per-fection, free from evil-doing, and never without good; the Hereafter (*ma'ãd*), the meaning of which is clear and does not vary between Muslims; Prophethood (*nubuwwah*), which is the belief in the message of the Prophet of Islam, may Allãh bless him and his family and grant them salvation, and that he is the seal of the prophets, after whom no prophet will appear, and that the Holy Qur'ãn is the book which Allãh sent down to him as proof of his prophethood and a manifestation of His message; and the Imãmate, the explanation of which will follow.

b

***Elaborations on the issues of Unicity, Justice, the Hereafter, Prophethood, and the Imãmate*:** It is not necessary that every *mukallaf* – that is, everyone who has the necessary prerequisites for responsibility for his duties – should know these details; nor does he have to learn about these elaborations to the point where he believes in them – as, on the contrary, it is necessary for him to learn how to pray, for example, in order to be able to perform the prayer–; ignorance in these cases is pardonable. Most of the contents of the book *I'tiqãdãu 'l-Imãmiyyah*, with respect to the elaborations on the five principles we have indicated, belong to this second catagory. Our Shaykh aṣ-Ṣadūq did not intend to clarify simply those beliefs incumbent upon the individual, but rather those beliefs, which the Imãmiyyah hold as a whole, whether or not such a belief was requisite. The intention in this was to give a clear, comprehensible picture of the doctrines of the Imãmiyyah in matters which had caused concern among certain Muslims, whether there was agreement in the matter or not.

I have made this point in order that we may avoid gross

mistakes or inaccuracy in understanding the Imãmiyyah and their beliefs. As a single example of learned and detailed investigation to this effect, one has the work of a scholar who is considered one of the most renowned Imãmī scholars and *fuqahã'*, the Shaykh Murtaḍã al-Anṣãrī (1214/1800–1281/1864), in his well-known textbook *Farãidu 'l-uṣūl*, which is famous as *ar-Rasãil*, where he discusses the problem of the sufficiency of probable opinion (*ẓann*) in the principles of the religion; and there are additionally the glosses which a group of the greatest and the most knowledgable *mujtahid*s and jurists of the Imãmiyyah in recent times have written on it.[18]

6
THE BELIEFS OF THE IMÃMIYYAH

To begin with, the lmãmiyyah distinguish themselves from other Muslim groups by their doctrine of the divine Imãmate, from which they take their name. Thus Muslims are split into two sects on the basis of their different positions on the question of who should succeed the Prophet, may Allãh bless him and his family and grant them salvation. (The history of this division, when and why the schism occurred, is not our concern at this point.) First there are those who maintain that the Prophet of Allãh designated an imãm after him in a way which was unequivocal and did not require interpretation, that this was done through a revelation from Allãh and was not a result of his personal desire for which there was absolutely no divine command, and that he named them individually and said how many there would be, especially the first of them, he being ʻAlī, the Commander of the Faithful, peace be upon him; that the Imãms posess knowledge of the *sharīʻah*, infallibility, perfec-

[18] *ar-Rasãil*, offset, Tehran, 1377, pp.230-42.

tion, and the power to work miracles such as the Prophet posessed, and that they must be obeyed and revered as he must be; the only difference lies in Prophethood and the revelation of the Divine Law, which are peculiar to him – there is no prophet after him. Secondly, there are those who do not believe in the Imãmate in this sense, and who maintain instead that the matter of succession was either neglected, as the Prophet did not say anything definite about it, or that it was left to the Muslims themselves to choose whom they wished to rule over them, although they differed about how they should choose him, what his qualities should be, and the characteristics of the electors.

However, the differences between the Imãmiyyah and other Muslim sects concerning the Imãmate carries over to disagreements in many other matters, some of which pertain to basic dogma, and some to law and jurisprudence. The most important points of dogma in which the Imãmiyyah differed from other Muslim sects are as follows:

a

Regarding Unicity, they believe in the complete and total rejection of any belief in the corporeality of Allãh or in anthropomorphism, either in a literal or an interpreted sense. On this basis, they catagorically deny that Allãh is visible, either in this world or in the Hereafter, in wakefulness or in dreams. They also reject the attribution of spatio-temporal movement and translocation to Him, because they deny that time and place can be ascribed to Him.

b

They believe that the attributes of Allãh divide themselves into attributes of essence and attributes of action, and that the former exist in the very existence of His essence, and are absolutely

one with Him, eternally pre-existent in, not with, the pre-existence of His essence itself. On the other hand, attributes of action are, in reality, actions of Allãh, which come into existence. On this basis, they distinguish between the All-Knowing (*al-‘Ãlim*) and the Living (*al-Ḥayy*), and the Creator (*al-Khãliq*), the Provider (*ar-Rãziq*), and the Speaker (*al-Mutakallim*); (these examples are merely cited by way of illustration, and are by no means exhaustive). They also maintain that the second group of attributes derive from the actions of Allãh, and come into existence with the coming into existence of the act. For this reason, they do not believe that the Qur’ãn is eternally uncreated, although some of them avoided saying that it was created.

c

With respect to Justice (*‘adl*), whereby they counted themselves among the ‘Adliyyah, their belief contains both elaborations and consequence: (i) the impossibility of demanding that a legally responsible individual do that which he is unable to do; (ii) the impossibility of punishing an individual for that which he could not avoid doing, or was unable to do, except when his inability sprang from his own choice; (iii) the evil of punishment without clear notification; and (iv) the necessity for Allãh to establish a Proof (*ḥujjah*) for creatures by way of mercy (*luṭf*) – part of this is the sending of the Messenger.

7
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE IMÃMIYYAH AND THE MU‘TAZILAH

However, the picture of the Imãmiyyah and their beliefs which emerges among historians of the sect – and I am referring to those who were not themselves Imãmī – differs from the aforesaid in several respects. Even if these writers did not distin-

guish between Imãmī ideas and opinions and the kind of demonstration used, it is nevertheless a picture, which gives us reason to pause. There exists a prevailing opinion among them that these ideas and opinions were passed on to Imãmī scholars at a time somewhat after the formation of the sect, through their being influenced by the thinking of the Muʿtazilah and following their teachers.

This is the approach that Professor ʿIrfãn adopts in his introduction generally, and specifically in the third part, in which he comments upon the sections of the book in more detail; and this is one of the reasons we have not published it. This third part investigates the relationship between Shīʿī and Muʿtazilī theology at the time of the Buyids. He states:[19]

> A critical examination reveals that the shift in Shīʿī theology from its form based on *ḥadīth* to its rationalist, interpretative form was in the beginning inspired by the critical and rationalist positions of the Muʿtazilah . . .
>
> al-Mufīd exemplifies the novel rationalist direction in Shīʿī thought, which was responsible for the rejection of a literal interpretation of the divine *sharīʿah*, and which introduced rationalist and interpretative explanations of it into the teachings of the Imãmiyyah . . .
>
> A critical, comparative examination of the differences between *Taṣḥīḥu 'l-iʿtiqãd* and its precursors must centre itself upon the influence of the Muʿtazilah upon the Imãmiyyah.

In addition to these statements, in which he fails to distinguish between differences in belief and differences in the methods of proof or ways of demonstration, Professor ʿIrfãn also makes the following points:

i) That the Imãmiyyah were, at the beginning of their history, transmitters of *ḥadīth* and partisans of doctrines based solely

[19] *The Emendation of A Shīʿite Creed*, Intro., p.13ff.

upon the Holy Qur’ãn and the *Sunnah*, without recourse to reason (*‘aql*) and the sort of demonstration resting upon its use, which they rejected.
ii) That the shift in Shī‘ī theology from its early form to a subsequent variant one was a result of the contact of the Imãmiyyah with Mu‘tazilī ideas, by way of the instruction they received from Mu‘tazilī *shaykh*s and the influence of their views.
iii) That al-Mufīd was the first to complete this shift.
iv) That this judgement is based upon a comparison between the theological views of al-Mufīd and those of his predecessor aṣ-Ṣadūq.
v) That the 'rationalist school of theology', with which al-Mufīd is associated, is defined as 'the rational and metaphor-ical, or interpretative, explanation of the Muslim *sharī‘ah*.'

We shall treat the first four of these points in what follows. It is enough to comment here on the definition of the rationalist school he gives by saying that the *sharī‘ah* has two facets: the dogmatic aspect, or what is designated as the principles of the religion, which the faith requires of the Muslim, and the practical aspect, or derivatives of the religion, which are the divine laws associated with worship, transactions, rights, the judicial process, and all that which is investigated in the science of *fiqh*. Allãh forbid that our Shaykh al-Mufīd and all the Imãmiyyah, not to mention the Mu‘tazilah and those who followed them, such as the Zaydiyyah, should rely on rational or interpretative explanations for the derivatives of the religion, such as prayer, fasting, *zakãt*, *ḥajj*, and the other laws of worship and transactions, including everything contained in the *sharī‘ah* and explained comprehensively and succinctly in the books of *fiqh*. It is true that there are some who speak of a hidden meaning (*bãṭin*) in the *sharī‘ah*, and who explain prayer, fasting, and *ḥajj* in a way that excludes their being acts of worship; instead, they

maintain, the *sharī‘ah* contains secrets such that he who discovers them and holds faith in them has no need to act according to the ostensive meaning of the divine law, and that the burden of the law is lifted from him. How few are those who believe such things and speak of themselves as Muslims; and how many are those who accuse people of this falsely and maliciously, and are actually trying to dispel suspicion or repel accusations levelled at themselves.

It is necessary for us to add that rationalist and interpretative explanation of the Book [of Allãh] and the *Sunnah* regarding matters of belief is not, as some would have it, arbitrary or wishful, zealous or fanciful, or some sort of search for buried treasure, or a devilish incitement to revolt against Allãh and His Prophet. Rather, it centres upon the adoption of the stronger of two arguments, and the explication of the weaker of the two in light of the stronger, or on the basis of a comparison and evaluation of the evidence used. For this activity there are principles and guidelines, which form the subject matter of the science of *uṣūlu 'l-fiqh*.

8
THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE IN THE PRINCIPAL BELIEFS BETWEEN THE TWO IMÃMĪ SCHOOLS

The Shaykh aṣ-Ṣadūq stands out amongst the Imãmī scholars of Tradition and Narration. A few aspects of his distinctive character have been mentioned in the introduction to the English translation of his book *I‘tiqãdãtu 'l-Imãmiyyah*. He came from a scholarly family, distinguished in the science of *ḥadīth* and its transmission, and he faithfully adopted their methods. All of what he held conforms with what the Imãmī scholars of *ḥadīth* agreed upon, especially the Qummī school, or at least with what the greatest of them taught, except in a few

places, such as the inattention of the Prophet in prayer. In this latter opinion he followed his teacher Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥams ibn al-Walīd, whom the majority of scholars, Tradition-ist or otherwise, did not agree with.

A comparative study of *Iʻtiqãdãtu 'l-Imãmiyyah* and the commentary made upon it by the Shaykh al-Mufīd in *Taṣḥīḥu 'l-ʻtiqãd* reveals the overwhelming concurrance of the Traditionist and theological schools of the lmãmiyyah with respect to the principles of dogma and its details; in comparison, the points where the two schools disagree in these matters are very few. Indeed, the difference between them is only in the method of demonstrating their opinions in dogmatics.

A comparative study also reveals that criticisms by lmãmī theologians of the *ḥadīth* which the Traditionists relied upon did not arise essentially from their stances on dogma and their disagreements about the principles of theology, but rather was centred on standards for the criticism of the *ḥadīth* each Traditionist employed, through criticizing the chain of transmission, bringing its narration into question and showing that one of its transmitters was not trustworthy, or through casting doubt upon what it proved, rejecting it because it contradicted a stronger proof from the verses of the Holy Qur'ãn or from *ḥadīth* whose chain of transmission was superior to it or whose proof was clearer. This must be set against the accusation usually made by non-Imãmī Traditionists, including the theologians of the Jahmiyyah, Muʻtazilah, Murjiah, and others: that they completely rejected verses of the Holy Qur'ãn and well-established Prophetic *sunnah* if these disagreed with their own theological views.

It may be that the secret to understanding this methodological dispute between the Imãmī and non-Imãmī Traditionist schools goes back firstly to the difference between the nature of the Imãmī and non-Imãmī *ḥadīth* which each of them chose to

employ, as we shall indicate. Secondly, Imãmī and non-Imãmī *mutakallim*s are distinguishable in that rarely does one come upon an Imãmī *mutakallim* who is not also well versed in *ḥadīth* and its sciences, such that he combined these two qual-ities equally in his theology. If a man specialised in *ḥadīth*, he was not ignorant in *kalãm*, adopting a hostile and controver-sial stance opposing it; and if he was addressing theological issues, then he did not find himself able to dispense with *ḥadīth* and their soundness of transmission, as was said about others.

Another of the Shaykh al-Mufīd's works, *Awãilu 'l-maqãlãt fi 'l-madhãhib wa 'l-mukhtãrãt* reveals differences between Imãmī scholars up to his time, whether they were scholars exclusively of *ḥadīth* and *fiqh*, or exclusively of *kalãm* (to the best of my knowledge, this applies only to some members of the Banū Nawbakht), or of both. But these differences are few when compared to their agreements. Such a study also reveals differences between these scholars and those from other prominent sects of Muslims up to al-Mufīd's time.

On these matters, there is a need for a detailed study com-paring the books of aṣ-Ṣadūq and al-Mufīd. As space is limited here, however, it will suffice to cite the conclusions of a Western scholar, Dr. Martin J. McDermott, as they appear in his book *The Theology of al-Shaikh al-Mufīd*. Here I quote a short passage, in which he states:

> Ibn Bãbūya [aṣ-Ṣadūq] was a traditionist. When he set out to explain a difficulty or answer a question, he preferred to quote a tradition rather than reason out an answer of his own. Even his creed, the *Risãlat al-iʻtiqãdãt*, consists largely of traditions strung together. Nevertheless he did hold many of the same theses as the theologians, and when a tradition he was reporting seemed to contradict one of his theological views, on God's Unity or Justice, for example, Ibn Bãbūya would interject his own inter-pretation of the

> tradition.
>
> Herein lies Ibn Bãbūya's major difference from his pupil, al-Mufīd, who is a theologian as well as a traditionist. When a point can be proved both from revelation and an argument from reason, al-Mufīd generally prefers to rely on the latter, quoting the tradition or quranic text as supplementary argument.
>
> Most of the important theological doctrines held by Ibn Bãbūya and his pupil are the same. . . .

Here he goes on to review the points of difference between the two as evident in their books. Then he states:

> Ibn Bãbūyã, then, is a traditionist with many views that are akin to Mu'tazilite theses. Al-Mufīd is a theologian as well as a traditionist, and his views, though basically simi-lar to Ibn Bãbūya's, go further in a Mu'tazilite direction.[20]

I shall not comment on McDermott's words at all here, as the reader will himself find the differences between us in opinion and in conclusions in the following discussion.

9
WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TWO NON-IMÃMĪ SCHOOLS

We must examine, if only very briefly, what has been referred to up to now as the 'non-lmãmī school of theologians', since there are common points which are mentioned as stemming from the beliefs of the 'poeple of *ḥadīth* and Tradition', and on the basis of which their views and beliefs are weighed against those of others, which were in fact taken from the non-Imãmī school, and proofs and evidence which are mentioned in this

[20] Martin McDermott, *The Theology of al-Shaikh al-Mufīd*, Dãr al-Mashriq, Beirut, 1978, pp.367-9.

field which exist in a complete form in the body of *ḥadīth* which the non-Imãmī Traditionists relate, and which form the sole basis for the opinions which they adopted, or which were attributed to them.

In addition, the intellectual and doctrinal contradiction between the Traditionist and theological schools – in those days they were the Mu‘tazilah, the Jahmiyyah, the Murjiah, and those who followed in their wake – was borrowed from non-Imãmī *ḥadīth*, from the opinions of non-Imãmī Tradition-ists, from their attitude towards the views of the theologians, from their dismissal of them, and from their criticism of those who held them; and indeed, from their criticism of them for the theological trend, in a general sense, in religious belief.

It is not correct to make these general characteristics, or these general contradictions, into a general trait of either the Imãmī or the non-Imãmī Traditionist trend, which is above all else based on the Holy Qur’ãn and the *Sunnah*, in deducing and formulating religious doctrine.

What is called the 'Traditionist school' – a more accurate term for them, which they themselves prefer, is 'the people of *ḥadīth* and Tradition' (*ahlu 'l-ḥadīth wa 'l-athar*) – was not a school of thought which was defined and clearly characterized in all or many respects, as was the case with the Mu‘tazilah or the Jahmiyyah, for example, so that it is possible to specify what opinions they agreed upon, and what distinguished them from other sects. Moreover, this designation was assigned to them not by their own choosing, but was derived from their positions and views. All that they believed was: that those who were involved with *ḥadīth* should not go beyond the *ḥadīth* which had come down to them, and which they believed to be true, in explaining their opinions and representing their beliefs, but that they should rely on the narration of the ostensive wording of the *ḥadīth* for expressing their views and should not

change the wording for the convenience of the meaning.

Whatever we may say about them, the Traditionists certainly did not fit into one single mould, but rather into many, since the extent of the difference between any one Traditionist and any one of those they called theologians is only to be measured by the quantity of what the Traditionist narrated and the number of *ḥadīth* he narrated whose veracity he was committed to. It is clear that the Traditionists differed in the number of *ḥadīth*, which they narrated, and in the number, which they believed to be true. Moreover, they varied between those who had few and those who had many, and between those who were generous in judging veracity, and those who were strict, not judging them to be true unless many conditions were fulfilled. On this basis the *ḥadīth* differed in terms of those whose narrations they agreed upon and those, which were only narrated by some, as well as in terms of those whose veracity they were agreed upon and those whose veracity they were not agreed upon.

It should be noted that even though the Ash‘arī school was based on the rejection of Mu‘tazīlī thinking, its teaching was primarily concerned with reconciliation and not rejection. For the teaching encompassed by it and contained in it went back to Abu 'l-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī, ‘Alī ibn Ismã‘īl ibn Abī Bashīr, al-Baṣrī (260/874 or 270/883–324/936), the *imãm* of the Ash‘arīs, who quarrelled with his Mu‘tazīlī teachers over the fact that, according to him, they used to reject anything that went against their views even when the Holy Qur’ãn and the authentic *Sunnah*, in his own view, supported it. However, there is not enough space here to speak at length about this or to marshal the evidence concerning it.

10
EXAMPLES OF NON-IMÃMĪ TRADITIONIST OPINIONS

It is not necessary here to speak at length about the *ḥadīth*, which are from our non-Imãmī brothers, as it is possible for the reader to find them comprehensively collected in the following sources:

1. Muḥammad ibn Ismã‘īl, Abū ‘Abdillãh al-Bukhãrī (194/810 –256/870): *Khalq af‘ãli 'l-‘ibãd*;
2. Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥanbal, Abū ‘Abdillãh ash-Shaybãnī (164/780–241/855), the *imãm* of the Ḥanbalīs: *ar-Radd ‘ala 'l-Jahmiyyah wa 'z-Zanãdiqah*;
3. Abū ‘Abdi 'r-Raḥmãn, ‘Abdullãh ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, (213/828–288/901): *as-Sunnah*;
4. ‘Uthmãn ibn Sa‘īd, Abū Sa‘īd ad-Dãrimī (*c* 199/815–280/894): *ar-Radd ‘ala 'l-Jahmiyyah* and *ar-Radd ‘alã Bishr al-Marrīsī*;
5. Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Isḥãq ibn Khuzaymah as-Salamī an-Naysãbūrī (223/838–311/924): *at-Tawḥīd wa ithbãt ṣifati 'r-rabb*;
6. Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Abdillãh al-Ãjurī, ash-Shãfi‘ī, al-Baghdãdī (*c* 280/893–360/970): *ash-Sharī‘ah*.

And with reference to the interpretation of the Ash‘arīs, see:

1. Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Fūrak al-Iṣbahãnī, al-Ash‘arī, ash-Shãfi‘ī (d. 406/1015): *Mushkilu 'l-ḥadīth*;
2. Aḥmad (Ḥamad) ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrãhīm, Abū Sulaymãn al-Khaṭṭãbī, al-Bustī, al-Ash‘arī, ash-Shãfi‘ī (319/931–388/998): al-Bayhaqī has quoted, below, many of his works;
3. Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī, Abū Bakr al-Bayhaqī, al-Ash‘arī, ash-Shãfi‘ī (384/994–458/1066): *al-Asmã’ wa 'ṣ-ṣifãt* and *al-I‘tiqãd*;
4. ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Hibatillãh, Abu 'l-Qãsim ibn ‘Asãkir ad-Dimashqī, al-Ash‘arī, ash-Shãfi‘ī (499/1105–571/1176): *Tabyīn kidhbi 'l-muftarī fī-mã nasaba ilã Abi 'l-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī*.

All these sources are in print; al-Khaṭṭãbī's opinions are contained in al-Bayhaqī. I shall only give examples of the opinions of the Traditionists and ignore those who were *imãm*s of a *madhhab*, such as the Ḥanbalī Imãm Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, whose views and beliefs form the foundation for the doctrines of Ibn Taymiyyah, Taqiyyu 'd-Dīn, Aḥmad ibn ‘Abdi 'l-Ḥalīm al-Ḥarrãnī, al-Ḥanbalī (661/1263–728/1328), and Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdi 'l-Wahhãb an-Najdī al-Ḥanbalī (1115/1703–1206/1792), the heralds and leaders of the Salafiyyah, as they call themselves, or 'the Wahhãbiyyah', as others refer to them. I shall also steer clear of the *imãm*s of other *madhhab*s, lest someone should associate me with people with whom I do not wish to be associated. Those who wish to study the views of the Ḥanbalī and other schools can find them in the afore-mentioned sources; in connection with the defence of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, see the two following sources:

1. ‘Abdu 'r-Raḥmãn ibn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad, Abu 'l-Faraj ibn al-Jawzī al-Baghdãdī, al-Ḥanbalī (508/1114–597/1201): *Daf‘ shubahi 't-tashbīḥ bi-akuffi 't-tanzīh*;
2. Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdi 'l-Mu'min, Taqiyyu 'd-Dīn al-Ḥiṣnī, ad-Dimashqī, al-Ash‘arī, ash-Shãfi‘ī (752/1351–829/1426): *Daf‘ shubah man shabbaha wa tamarrada wa nasaba dhãlika ila 'l-Imãm Aḥmad*.

* * * * *

Abu 'l-Faraj ibn al-Jawzī stated:

> Know that all the Traditionists made the ostensive meaning of everything that had to do with the attributes of the Creator conform to the senses, and thus they were anthropomorphists, because they did not mix with the *fuqahã'*, so as to learn how to make the ambiguous conform with the unambiguous.[21]

He also said:

[21] *Talbīs Iblīs*, al-Munīriyyah Press, Cairo, 1368, p.116.

> Know that people are at three levels concerning reports of [His] attributes: first, at a level at which they are taken literally, with no explanation or interpretation, unless necessity demands it – as in the case of His words: *and thy Lord comes* [al-Fajr, 89:22], i.e., His decree came – *viz.* the Salafiyyah; secondly, at the level of interpretation, which is a perilous position; and thirdly, at a level which is called conformity with the senses, which is common among ignorant 'reporters' [by this he means the Traditionists], since they possess no part of the intellectual sciences, which let it be known what is possible and what is impossible for Allãh, for intellectual science turns the ostensive meanings of what is reported away from anthropomorphism. Since they were deprived of this, they were at liberty in Traditions to make them conform to the senses.[22]

In refutation of those who held that most of the Ḥanbalīs were corporealists and anthropomorphists, Ibn Taymiyyah said:

> The corporealists and anthropomorphists were more prevalent in groups other than [that of] the followers of the Imãm Aḥmad; these include certain groups of Kurds, all of whom are Shãfi‘ī, and among them is found more corporealism and anthropomorphism than in any other group, and the people of Gīlãn, among whom are Shãfi‘īs and Ḥanbalīs. As for the pure Ḥanbalīs, there was not as much of it among them as among others; the Karãmiyyah were all Ḥanafīs.[23]

I do not agree with Ibn Taymiyyah in his defence of the members of his school, but I shall remain silent about it – an apology to our brothers the Kurds whom Ibn Taymiyyah spoke

---

[22] *Daf‘ shubahi 't-tashbīh bi-akuffi 't-tanzīh*, al-Maktabah at-Tawfīqiyyah, Cairo, 1976, pp.73-74.

[23] *al-Munãẓirah fi 'l-‘aqīdati 'l-Wãsiṭiyyah, Majmū‘atu 'r-rasãili 'l-kubrã*, Dãr Iḥyã’ at-Turãthi 'l-‘Arabī, Beirut, offprint 2, 1392/1972, vol.1, p.418.

of as he did, for they know him as well as I do. As for the people of Gīlãn, they stopped being Shãfi‘ī and Ḥanbalī centuries ago, and today they are all Imãmī Shī‘ī.

11
THE POSITION OF NON-IMÃMĪ TRADITIONISTS ON ANTHROPOMORPHISM

As examples of what Ibnu 'l-Jawzī pointed out in his discussion of the Traditionists, I shall choose three who are not clear-cut Ḥanbalīs, and I shall provide a short biography of each of them, so that I will not be accused of having stumbled upon two obscure and undistinguished men who were of little significance among Traditionists:

1. Isḥãq ibn Ibrãhīm ibn Makhlad ibn Ibrãhīm, Abū Ya‘qūb al-Ḥanẓalī al-Marwazī, Ibn Rãhwayh an-Naysãbūrī (161/778–238/853). al-Kãtib said: "He was one of the leaders of the Muslims, a landmark in religion; he combined knowledge of *ḥadīth* and *fiqh*, his memeory was excellent and reliable, and he was pious and an ascetic. He travelled to Iraq, the Ḥijãz, Yemen, and Shãm . . . He came to Baghdad and became familiar with the memorizers of *ḥadīth* there, and exchanged narrations with them. He returned to Khurãsãn and settled in Naysãbūr."

al-Mazzī and as-Subkī said of him: "He was the teacher of al-Bukhãrī, Muslim, at-Tirmidhī, Abū Dãwūd, and an-Nasã’ī, . . . Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, . . . and Yaḥyã ibn Mu‘īn . . ."

Nu‘aym ibn Ḥammãd said: "If you see an ‘Irãqī casting aspersions on Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, have your doubts about his beliefs; and if you see a Khurãsãnī casting aspersions on Isḥãq ibn Rãhwayh, have your doubts about his beliefs." And an-Nasã’ī said: "He was a leader, trustworthy, reliable." Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal said: "If Abū Ya‘qūb [Ibn Rãhwayh], the com-mander of the traditionists, narrates something to you, hold on to it."

Abū Ḥãtim said: "He was a leader of the Muslims." Ibn Ḥibbãn said: "Isḥãq was a leader of his time in *fiqh* and reli-gious sciences, a memorizer [of *ḥadīth*], someone who held opinions [in these sciences], someone who wrote books, made deductions from Prophetic Traditions and defended them, and suppressed those who opposed them. His grave is well known and is visited." Abū ʻAbdillãh al-Ḥãkim said: "He was the leader of his time in memorizing *ḥadīth* and giving *fatwa*s." Abū Nuʻaym al-Iṣbahãnī said: "Isḥãq [ibn Rãhwayh] was an associate of Aḥmad [ibn Ḥanbal]; he elevated [the status of] *ḥadīth* and reduced deviators to nothing." adh-Dhahabī said: "The great leader, the *shaykh* of the East, the master of the memorizers [of *ḥadīth*]. On account of his memory he was the leading commentator [on the Qur'ãn], one of the heads of *fiqh*, and a leader in *ijtihãd*."[24]

Abū ʻĪsã at-Tirmidhī, after narrating a Tradition in which it is said that Allãh accepts alms (*ṣadaqah*) and takes it by His right hand, said:

> More than one of the *ḥadīth* scholars has said concerning this *ḥadīth* and those like it which speak of His Attributes, and concerning the descent of Allãh, blessed be He and Exalted, every night to the lowest heaven: 'The narrations about this are confirmed, and must be believed in, but one should neither conceive nor ask the question "How?"' Similar reports are narrated from Mãlik ibn Anas, Sufyãn ibn ʻUyaynah, and ʻAbdullãh ibn al-Mubãrak, concerning these kinds of Traditions: 'Act on them without [asking]

[24] al-Bukhãrī, *at-Tãrīkhu 'l-kabīr*, vol.1, pt.1, pp.379-80; Ibn Abī Ḥãtim, *al-Jarḥ wa 't-taʻdīl*, vol.2, pp.209-10; Ibn Ḥibbãn, *ath-Thiqãt*, vol.8, pp.115-6; al-Khatīb, *Tãrīkh Baghdãd*, vol.6, pp.345-55; Abū Nuʻaym, *Ḥilyatu 'l-awliyã'*, vol.9, pp.234-8; al-Mazzī, *Tahdhību 'l-kamãl*, vol.2, pp.373-88; adh-Dhahabī, *Siyar aʻlãmi 'n-nubalã"*, vol.11, pp.358-82; *Tadhkiratu 'l-ḥuffãẓ*, vol.2, pp.433-5; Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhību 't-tahdhīb*, vol.2, pp.216-9.

how.' And this is the opinion of the Sunnī scholars. On the other hand, the Jahmiyyah denied the validity of these *ḥadīth*, saying: 'This is anthropomorphism.'

In several places in the Holy Qur’ãn, Allãh, the Mighty, the Exalted, says: 'hand', 'hearing', 'sight', and the Jahmiyyah gave a linguistic interpretation (*ta’wīl*) of these verses, and gave a different exegesis from that of the *ḥadīth* scholars, saying: 'Allãh did not create by His hand; the meaning of 'hand' here being power (*quwwah*).'

Isḥãq ibn Ibrãhīm:[25] 'There is only anthropomorphism when one says: "A hand like [another] hand, or similar to [another] hand; or hearing like [another] hearing, or similar to [another] hearing", and when one says: "hearing like [another] hearing, or similar to [another] hearing", this is anthropomorphism. But if one says, as Allãh, the Exalted, said: "hand", "hearing", "sight", and does not ask how, and does not say: "similar to [another] hearing" or: "like [another] hearing", this is not anthropomorphism, and is like Allãh, the Exalted, saying: *There is nothing like unto Him; He is the All-hearing, the All-seeing.*'[26]

From this it is clear that at-Tirmidhī was in agreement with this latter opinion.

2. Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Isḥãq ibn Khuzaymah as-Sulamī an-Naysãbūrī (223/838–311/924), of whom it was said: He was the *imãm* of Naysãbūr in his time, a *faqīh*, a *mujtahid*, a sea among the seas of knowledge, whose advancement in science was recognized by all people of his period; aṣ-Ṣafadī, al-Yãfi‘ī, adh-Dhahabī, as-Subkī, Ibnu 'l-Jazarī, as-Suyūṭī, and Ibn ‘Abdi 'l-Ḥayy nicknamed him '*imãm* of the *imãm*s'. ad-Dãr Quṭnī said: "He was an *imãm* without equal." Ibn Kathīr stated: "He is one of the *mujtahid*s in the religion of Islam, and they say that he

---

[25] = Isḥãq ibn Rãhwayh, *‘Ãriḍah al-aḥwadhī*, vol.30, p.332.

[26] *al-Jãmi‘u 'ṣ-ṣaḥīḥ: zakãt*, chap. "ṣadaqah", vol.3, pp.50-51, no.662.

has miraculous powers (*karãmãt*)." as-Sam'ãnī stated: "Many [of the Traditionists] can be traced back to him, each one of whom was spoken of as a Khuzaymī [as he was the *imãm* of a Traditionist school]." This is a small sample of what was said about him.[27]

Ibn Khuzaymah asserted that Allãh has a face. He said: "The meaning of this is not that His face is like a human face; otherwise anyone could say that humans had a face, and pigs, monkeys, and dogs, and so on, have faces, and that the faces of humans are like the faces of pigs, monkeys, and dogs . . .[28]

Similarly, he mentions the eye, the hand, the palm, and the right side, saying: "The eyes of Allãh are unlike any other eyes." He adds:

> We say that our Lord the Creator has two eyes, by which He can see that which lies beneath the ground and under the seventh and lowest earth, and that which is in the highest heavens, and all that lies in between . . . Let us add a commentary and explanation and say: The eye of Allãh is eternal and everlasting, and its strength continues for-ever, and is never destroyed or extinguished, while the eyes of human beings come into being; they did not exist and were not created, then Allãh brought them into being and created them with His Word, which is one of His essential

[27] adh-Dhahabī, *Tadhkiratu 'l-ḥuffãẓ*, vol.2, pp.720-31, *al-'Ibar*, vol.2, p.149; as-Sam'ãnī, *al-Ansãb*, vol.5, p.124; Ibnu '1-Athīr, *al-Lubãb*, vol.1, p.442; Ibnu 'l-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol.6, pp.184-6; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidãyah wa 'n-nihãyah*, vol.11, p.149; as-Subkī, *Ṭabaqãtu 'sh-Shãfi'iyyah*, vol.3, pp.109-19; aṣ-Ṣafadī, *al-Wãfī bi 'l-wafayãt*, vol.2, p.196; al-Yãfi'ī, *Mir'ãtu 'l-jinãn*, vol.2, p.264; Ibn 'Abdi 'l-Ḥayy, *Shadharãtu 'dh-dhahab*, vol.2, pp.262-3; as-Suyūṭī, *Ṭabaqãtu 'l-ḥuffãẓ*, pp.310-1; Ibnu 'l-Jazarī, Ṭ*abaqãtu 'l-qurrã'*, vol.2, pp.97-98.

[28] *at-Tawḥīd wa ithbãt ṣifati 'r-rabb*, revised and commented upon by Muḥammad Khalīl Harãs, teacher in the College of *Uṣūlu 'd-Dīn* (in al-Azhar), al-Azhar University Library, Cairo, 1387/1968, p.23.

attributes . . .[29]

He states that Allãh has two hands: 'His two eternal hands are everlasting, while created hands come into being . . . What a comparison!'[30] Interpretation is excluded from all this, especially the interpretation of His hands as Favour and Power.[31]

He mentions that:

> The speech of our Lord does not resemble the speech of created beings, because the speech of Allãh is unbroken, uninterrupted by a pause or mannerism, unlike the words of humans, which are broken by mannerisms and silences due to pauses [for breath], or reflection, or fatigue . . .[32]

3. ‘Uthmãn ibn Sa‘īd, Abū Sa‘īd ad-Dãrimī, at-Tamīmī, as-Sijistãnī (*c* 199/815–280/894), al-Imãm al-Ḥãfiẓ al-Ḥujjah, a thorn in the flesh of the heretics, an upholder of the *sunnah*, trustworthy, established, an authority. It is said of him: He was an *imãm* who was emulated during his life and after his death. The Shãfi‘īs mentioned him in their biographies, and the Ḥanbalīs count him among the followers of Ibn Ḥanbal.[33]

ad-Dãrimī stated that Allãh has a place (*makãn*), which he demarcated as the throne (*al-‘arsh*),[34] and that He is clearly visible to His creation, above His throne in the atmosphere of the Afterlife, where there is no other creature, and no sky above Him.[35] He said:

---

[29] *Ibid.*, pp.50-55.
[30] *Ibid.*, pp.82-85.
[31] *Ibid.*, pp.85-88.
[32] *Ibid.*, p.145.
[33] *Tadhkiratu 'l-ḥuffãẓ*, vol.2, pp.621-2; *al-‘Ibar*, vol.2, p.64; *Mir’ãtu 'l-jinãn*, vol.2, p.193; Ibn Kathīr, vol.11, p.69; *Ṭabaqãtu 'sh-Shãfi‘iyyah*, vol.2, pp.302-6; *Ṭabaqãtu 'l-ḥuffãẓ*, p.274; *Ṭabaqãtu 'l-Ḥanãbilah*, vol.1, p.221.
[34] *ar-Radd ‘alã Bishr al-Marrīsī, ‘Aqãid as-salaf*, published by Dr ‘Alī Sãmī an-Nashshãr, ‘Ammãr Jam‘ī aṭ-Ṭãlibī; Munsha’atu 'l-Ma‘ãrif, Alexandria, Egypt, 1971, p.382.
[35] *Ibid.*, p.439.

We have specified a single place for Him, the highest, purest, and most noble place: His mighty throne . . . above the seventh, highest heaven, where there are no men or jinn, no smoke, no toilet, and no devil. You [Bishr al-Marrīsī][36], along with the rest of your misguided colleagues, claim that He is in every place, in smoke, in the toilet, and next to every man and jinn! Is it you who anthropomorphize Him, when you speak of incarnation in places, or us?[37]

He said:

If Allãh did not have hands with which to create Adam and touch him as you claimed, then it would not be possible to say [of Allãh]: by Your gracious hand.[38]

Thus he ignored all meaning or explanation relating to Favour or Power, save for the two hands [for which there is a meaning, since they are the organs dedicated to sensation].[39]

Truly Allãh has two fingers . . . and two legs; there is no other interpretation.[40]

Although we do say, as Allãh states: *The face of thy Lord remains* (ar-Raḥmãn, 55:27). By this He meant the face that is turned towards the believers, and not good works, or the *qiblah* . . .[41]

The refutation of anthropomorphism is rather that Allãh posesses all these, but that they are not analogous to created things.[42]

---

[36] i.e., Bishr ibn Ghiyãth al-Marrīsī, al-Baghdãdī, al-Ḥanafī (*c* 138/755–218/833), the scholar who proclaimed and defended the theory that the Qur’ãn was created, along with other Mu‘tazilī ideas, whom ad-Dãrimī is refuting.

[37] *Ibid.*, p.454.

[38] *Ibid.*, p.387.

[39] *Ibid.*, p.398.

[40] *Ibid.*, pp.420, 423-4, 427-8.

[41] *Ibid.*, p.516.

[42] *Ibid.*, p.432-3, 508.

I have cited the above as specific examples of what has been stated about the non-Imãmī Traditionist school, and I shall not add anything to them, except what I consider necessary to note – in a very brief manner – regarding the intention of corporealism and anthropomorphism which is refuted of Allãh, and which certain proofs have refuted. The real meaning of the doctrine of corporealism or what underpins it, such as limbs or bodily extremities, locality, and time, requires the comparison of Allãh with created beings; anthropomorphism lies at the root of corporealism and its consequences, not in its typology or particularities. The doctrine that Allãh has a head or a stomach, for example – may Allãh be raised above such things – requires corporealism, and leads in the end to Allãh being comparable with created beings. Either His head or stomach are comparable to created heads or stomachs, or they do not resemble any of these heads or stomachs and are rather distinguished as a head which does not resemble any other, and a stomach which does not resemble any other, and so on for other things besides the head and the stomach.

With respect to the *ḥadīth* which they pass on and maintain as true (the sources will be mentioned), 'Allãh created Adam in His own image', according to those who explain it as the image of Allãh, and another *ḥadīth*, that Adam was created in the image of the Merciful (*ar-Raḥmãn*), these do not refer to the belief that Allãh has an image or a face, and that is all, but [to the belief] that His image and His face resemble the face and image of Adam and resemble man's face and the image of him.

12
COMPARISON OF THE IMÃMĪ AND NON-IMÃMĪ SCHOOLS

For a comparison between the above and that which is as-

sociated with the Imãmiyyah, the reader can refer to what I have written about the Imãmī Traditionists in what I have said concerning aṣ-Ṣadūq and *al-I‘tiqãdãtu 'l-Imãmiyyah* and his connection with al-Mufīd and *Taṣḥīḥu 'l-i‘tiqãd*. What follows is a discussion of the *Hishãmayn*, [i.e.] Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam and Hishãm ibn Sãlim, who were accused of corporealism and anthropomorphism. As for others besides them, and those whose names are mentioned alongside them, I do not deny that there were among the Imãmiyyah those who spoke of determinism (*jabr*) and anthropomorphism, or who were accused of it, but these were very few. It is natural, with respect to all sects, and in all intellectual and religious communities, for a member or members to deviate, to stand apart with ideas and convictions, which are at odds with the group they originate from. To judge the group itself by way of judgements drawn from the stance of these few is incorrect, unless they form the majority, or are prominent or predominate to the extent that they become representative of their sect, and a model for them.

Another example which underscores what I have said comes from a study of the commentaries on *al-Kãfī* in what concerns the *ḥadīth* on Unicity in *Kitãbu 't-Tawḥīd*. Of the many commentaries of *al-Kãfī* there are four, all in print, by four contemporaneous scholars. They are:-

1. Ṣadru 'd-Dīn, Muḥammad ibn Ibrãhīm ibn Yaḥyã al-Qawãmī, ash-Shīrãzī, Ṣadru 'l-Muta’allihīn (979/1571–1050/1640): *Sharḥu 'l-Kãfī*, dealing with what is contained in the first part of the *Kitãbu 'l-Ḥujjah* in the *Uṣūlu 'l-Kãfī*.
2. Muḥammad Ṣãliḥ ibn Aḥmad al-Mãzandarãnī (d. 1086/1675), the famous scholar and Traditionist: *Sharḥ Uṣūlu 'l-Kãfī wa 'r-Rawḍah*.
3. al-Fayḍ al-Kãshãnī, Muḥammad Muḥsin (1010/1599–1091/1690), in his comments on the *ḥadīth* of *al-Kãfī* on Unicity in his book *al-Wãfī*.

4. al-‘Allãmah al-Majlisī, Muḥammad Bãqir ibn Muḥammad Taqī (1037/1628–1110/1699): *Mir'ãtu 'l-'uqūl*, which comments extensively on *al-Kãfī*.

These four differ with respect to their intellectual orientations, their knowledge of the sciences, and their specialization in its branches. Among them, one was considered an outstanding authority in Islamic philosophy, the master of one of its most famous schools, i.e., Ṣadru 'l-Muta'allihīn. Another was among those who stood between philosophy, *fiqh*, and *ḥadīth*, i.e., al-Fayḍ, and the two others were largely concerned with *ḥadīth* and its sciences, i.e., al-Majlisī and his brother-in-law al-Mãzandarãnī. A study of their commentaries and their concurrance on *ḥadīth* transmitted from the Imãms of the *Ahlu 'l-Bayt*, peace be upon them, concerning Unicity and Justice should provide us with the strongest evidence for what I have stated about the Imãmiyyah: that whatever the differences in their approaches their opinions about that which related to the fundamentals of the faith did not differ.

At the most basic level, the fundamental reason for this goes back to the nature of the Imãmī *ḥadīth* itself, and the fact that they differ from non-Imãmī *ḥadīth*. The *ḥadīth* related by non-Imamī sects – and I have listed the names of the books which refer to these *ḥadīth*, and which treat of their explanations, and of the interpretations of those which require interpretation – do not contain a trace of anything that refutes corporealism, anthropomorphism, or determinism, while at the same time they abound in *ḥadīth* which on the surface support corporealism, anthropomorphism, and determinism. The interpreters could not find reliable *ḥadīth* which explicitly refute anthropomorphism, thus enabling them to solve the problem by explicating *ḥadīth* with *ḥadīth* or by interpretating what appears to affirm it through that which textually negates it, so they were compelled to take refuge in other methods of interpretation.

This is clearly apparent in the works of Ibn Fūrak, al-Khaṭṭābī, and al-Bayhaqī – mentioned above – and also in what was written by Abu 'l-Maʻãlī al-Juwaynī, ʻAbdu '1-Malik ibn ʻAbdillãh an-Naysãbūrī ash-Shãfiʻī (419/1028–478/1085), the famous Ashʻarī theologian, in his books on theology, and Fakhru 'd-Dīn ar-Rãzī, Muḥammad ibn ʻUmar ash-Shãfiʻī (544/1150–606/1210), the *imãm* of the theologians, the well-known Ashʻarī commentator, in his famous Commentary on the Holy Qur'ãn and in his books on theology. It is also evident in the interpretations of Ibnu 'l-Jawzī and Taqiyyu 'd-Dīn al-Ḥiṣnī, in their two books on religion mentioned previously. A study of these interpretations should provide the strongest proof of what we have said.

The situation with Imãmī *ḥadīth* was the opposite of this. The *ḥadīth* on Unicity are cited in the *Kitãbu 't-Tawḥīd* in al-Kulaynī's *al-Kãfī*, the Shaykh aṣ-Ṣadūq's *Kitãbu 't-Tawḥīd*, and the *Kitãbu 't-Tawḥīd wa 'l-ʻadl* from the well-known encyclopaedia of *ḥadīth*, the ʻAllãmah al-Majlisī's *Biḥãru 'l-anwãr*. The latter contains all that was passed down in the Imãmī sources, whether it was firmly established or incompletely transmitted, whether its chain of authority was correct or incorrect, and is to be found in the modern edition in six sections (vols.3-8). Whoever refers to them will find them without equal, for they are replete with sound *ḥadīth*, one after the other, complete, and meaningful, which clearly prove the refutation of anthropomorphism, corporealism, and determinism, and which specifically prove the majority of what the Imãmiyyah believe regarding Unicity and Justice, along with that which they share with other Muslims. For this reason, al-Kulaynī and aṣ-Ṣadūq did not find any difficulty in demonstrating the falsity of these doctrines, except in the fact that they had to choose from an enormous number of *ḥadīth*, which plainly and clearly demonstrated it.

On top of all this, there is what the Shaykh aṣ-Ṣadūq pointed out in the opening of the *Kitãbu 't-Tawḥīd*, when he said:

> What led me to write my book was that I found people among those who opposed us attributing the doctrines of anthropomorphism and determinism to our group, since they found information in their books of whose explanation they were ignorant or whose meaning they did not understand, and which they took out of context and failed to compare word by word with the Qur'ãn [to see if it concurred with the holy Qur'ãn in word and meaning, for if the holy Qur'ãn substantiated anthropomorphism and determinism, then it was proof, and if they did not speak of a proof for this in the Qur'ãn why did they speak of its proof in *ḥadīth*]. In this way they denounced our school before the ignorant, obscured our path for them, diverted people from the religion of Allãh, and prompted them to reject the proofs of Allãh. I have sought favour with Allãh in writing this book on Unicity and on the refutation of anthropomorphism and determinism . . .[43]

The essence of the discussion is that the Imãmiyyah studied their beliefs in light of the *ḥadīth* passed down from the Imãms, peace be upon them, and that this study clearly revealed that what they believed derived from these *ḥadīth*, and that the contents of the *ḥadīth* were consistent whether they had been narrated on the authority of the first Imãm, the Commander of the Faithful, peace be upon him, or from the eleventh Imãm, or the Awaited Proof, peace be upon them, for example. The reason for this is that after having professed belief in the Imãmate and sworn obediance to the Imãms, peace be upon them, as I previously noted regarding the meaning of the Imãmate among the Imãmiyyah, they took their beliefs from them, just as they took their laws. A study of the two books *I'tiqãdãtu 'l-*

---

[43] *at-Tawḥīd*, Maktabatu 'ṣ-Ṣadūq, Tehran, 1387, p.17-18.

Imãmiyyah by aṣ-Ṣadūq and *Taṣḥīḥu 'l-iʻtiqãd* by al-Mufīd suffices to uphold this view, especially since aṣ-Ṣadūq's book is no more than a compilation of the contents of *ḥadīth* and Qur'ãnic verses employing the same words and phrases as we have mentioned previously.

I shall not dwell on the idea that the Imãmiyyah drew on the Muʻtazilah and were influenced by them in the beliefs they concurred upon except to say that it is a baseless falsehood without a speck of truth in it, and without any support from the study of the beliefs of the Imãmiyyah and the foundations upon which these beliefs are based. The question, which deserves attention, is whether anyone apart from the Imãmiyyah took their beliefs from the Imãms. I shall not attempt to look into this aspect here; it is enough to point out that al-Kaʻbī al-Balkhī, the Qãḍī ʻAbdu 'l-Jabbãr, Ibnu 'l-Murtaḍã, and Nashwãn al-Ḥimyarī trace the origin of the Muʻtazilah School, with respect to Justice and Unicity, to the Commander of the Faithful, peace be upon him.[44]

adh-Dhahabī said: "Zurqãn [the famous Muʻtazilī *mutakallim*] said: 'Abu 'l-Hudhayl al-ʻAllãf narrated to us: "I have taken what I believe concerning Justice and Oneness from ʻUthmãn aṭ-Ṭawīl, and he informed me that he took it from Wãṣil ibn ʻAṭã', who took it from ʻAbdullãh ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah, who took it from his father, who took it from his father ʻAlī, who took it from the Messenger of Allãh, may Allãh bless him [and his family] and grant [them] peace, who narrated that Gabriel came down with it from Allãh, the Sublime."' Several people have narrated this from Zurqãn."[45]

---

[44] al-Balkhī, *Dhikru 'l-Muʻtazilah*, p.64; al-Qãḍī ʻAbdu 'l-Jabbãr, *Faḍlu 'l-iʻtizãl wa dhikru 'l-Muʻtazilah*, pp.146-7, 150, 163, 214-5; Ibnu 'l-Murtaḍã, *al-Munyah wa 'l-amal*, pp.26-27, 125-8; *al-Baḥru 'z-zakhkhãr*, vol.1, p.44; Nashwãn al-Ḥimyarī, *Ḥūru 'l-ʻīyn*, p.206.

[45] *Siyar aʻlãmi 'n-nubalã'*, vol.13, p.149.

It must be pointed out that if something is found in *I‘tiqãdãtu 'l-Imãmiyyah* which al-Mufīd did not comment on or which he affirmed, which he objected to or did not accept, or with the proof of which, as given by aṣ-Ṣadūq, he was not satisfied, it is not consequently established that other Imãmī scholars agreed with either or both of them, deemed their proofs correct, agreed with the demonstrations of their opinions, or accepted al-Mufīd's objections. Naturally, this aspect of the two books is restricted to the details of what is mentioned in them, not to the fundamental beliefs, which all the Imãmiyyah are agreed upon.

13
THE NATURE OF IMÃMĪ TRADITIONS REJECTS CORPOREALISM AND ANTHROPOMORPHISM

One example, which I shall cite, of the hundreds of examples, which demonstrate the nature of Imãmī *ḥadīth* and their insistence that no inclination towards corporealism and anthropomorphism or determinism should find a place in the soul of anyone who believes in them, is what was narrated on the authority of the Commander of the Faithful, peace be upon him, in the words of one of his famous speeches.

This is the speech mentioned by ash-Sharīf ar-Raḍī, Abu 'l-Ḥasan Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Mūsawī (359/970–406/1015) in *Nahju 'l-Balãghah*, and which was narrated by the Imãmī Traditionists who came before him. The Shaykh aṣ-Ṣadūq (*c* 306/919–381/991) transmitted, and partially commented upon, a large section from the beginning of this sermon in his *Kitãbu 't-Tawḥīd*,[46] though this differs somewhat in wording from the versions in *Nahju 'l-Balãghah*, and *al-Biḥãr*.[47]

[46] Maktabatu 'ṣ-Ṣadūq, Tehran, 1387, pp.48-56.
[47] Vol.4, pp.274-84.

Abu 'n-Naḍr Muḥammad ibn Mas‘ūd as-Sulamī al-‘Ayyãshī (d. *c* 320/932) also narrated it, and extracted a portion of it in his *Tafsīr*,[48] and this is narrated in *al-Biḥãr*,[49] and in the *Tafsīru 'l-burhãn*.[50] All of them traced the chain of authority from themselves back to Mas‘adah ibn Ṣadaqah, who narrated it on the authority of the Imãm aṣ-Ṣãdiq, and on the authority of his father, peace be upon them both. This person is Abū Muḥammad, Mas‘adah ibn Ṣadaqah al-‘Abdī, a follower of aṣ-Ṣãdiq and al-Kãẓim, peace be upon them both, who wrote *Kitãb Khuṭab Amīr al-Mu'minīn ‘alayhi 's-salãm*.[51] Zaydī Traditionists such as Yaḥyã ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥasanī, an-Nãṭiq bi 'l-Ḥaqq, the Zaydī *imãm* (340/952–424/1033), narrated it with another chain of authority ending with Zayd ibn Aslam,[52] who narrated it directly from the Commander of the Faithful, peace be upon him. His wording is close to that of aṣ-Ṣadūq, although the chain of authority differs. The author of *Taysīru 'l-maṭãlib fī amãli 'l-Imãm Abī Ṭãlib*[53] cites a large portion of it, as does Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Rabbih al-Qurṭubī al-Mãlikī (246/860–328/940) in his *al-‘Iqdu 'l-farīd*.[54]

The Commander of the Faithful, peace be upon him,

---

[48] Vol.1, p.163, no.5.

[49] Vol.3, p.257.

[50] Vol.1, p.271, no.12.

[51] an-Najãshī, p.259, *Majma‘u 'r-rijãl*, vol.6, p.87; *adh-Dharī‘ah*, vol.7, p.191, no.972.

[52] This would appear to be a scribal error, the true person being Zayd ibn Wahb al-Jahni (d. 96/715), one of the greatest of the Followers of the Companions of the Prophet, and one of the followers of the Imãm ‘Alī, who wrote a *Kitãb Khuṭab Amīr al-Mu'minīn ‘alayhi 's-salãm ‘ala 'l-manãbir fi 'l-jum‘ah wa 'l-a‘yãd wa ghayrihã*; see aṭ-Ṭūsī, a*l-Fihrist*, p.97; *Ma‘ã1imu 'l-‘ulamã'*, p.44; *Majma'u 'r-rijãl*, vol.3, p.85; *adh-Dharī‘ah*, vol.7, p.189. no.965.

[53] Mu'assasat al-A‘lamī, Beirut, Lebanon, 1395/1975, pp.202-4.

[54] Board of Writing, Translation, and Publication, Cairo, 2nd ed., 1381/ 1962, vol.4, pp.152-4.

delivered this sermon from the pulpit in Kūfah. A man said to him, while he was speaking: "Describe our Lord as we will see Him with our eyes . . ." and he became angry with him and summoned the community to prayer; and the people collected about him until the mosque was packed with his followers, and he said, among other things (according to the narration of ash-Sharīf ar-Raḍī):

> I bear witness that whoever makes a likeness for You out of the disparate limbs of Your creation and the connection of the sockets of their joints which you have clothed in Your wisdom has not fixed the innermost part of his mind on knowledge of You, nor has certainty informed his heart that there is no equal to You. It is as if he had not heard the followers absolving themselves from those they [falsely] follow, saying: *By Allãh, we were in manifest error when we made you equal with the Lord of the worlds* (ash-Shu‘arã’, 26:97-98). The transgressors falsify You when they liken You to their idols, attribute to You with their imaginations the adornment of created things, divide You up in their minds according to the partition of bodies, and judge You by analogy with natural constitutions and their various powers through the talents of their intellects. I bear witness that whoever equates You with a thing of Your creation has put You on the same level with it, and that whoever does so is a disbeliever, according to that which has been revealed through the unambiguous among Your verses and that which the evidence of Your clear proof pronounces. For truly You are Allãh Who cannot be confined to the mind so as to be brought into conformity with the vicissitudes of its thinking, nor to the deliberation of its mental operations to be limited and subject to whims.[55]

[55] *Nahju 'l-Balãghah*, the commentary of Muḥammad ‘Abduh and Muḥammad Muḥyi 'd-Dīn ‘Abdu 'l-Ḥamid, al-Istiqãmah Press, Cairo, vol.1, pp.

I do not wish to comment on this section of the sermon, in which the Imãm pointed out the reasons for the occurance of anthropomorphism and corporealism among the Imãmiyyah in its early days, 'when they liken You to their idols . . .' However, I will say that someone who believes that these words, and others from the *ḥadīth* of the *Ahlu 'l-Bayt*, are from an infallible Imãm who commands an obedience not unlike that of the Messenger of Allãh, peace be upon him and his progeny, (and I have already demonstrated the belief of the Imãmiyyah in the Imãmate and the Imãm) would hardly be naturally inclined (except in abnormal circumstances) to speak about anthropomorphism or corporealism except in an unknowing way. The Qãḍī ‘Abdu 'l-Jabbãr al-Mu‘tazilī ash-Shãfi‘ī said:

> As for the Commander of the Faithful, peace be upon him, his sermons declaring the refutation of anthropomorphism and upholding Justice are more than can be counted . . .[56]

He also stated:

> If you look at the sermons of the Commander of the Faithful, you will find them replete with refutations of the visibility of Allãh.[57]

14
ANTI-IMÃMĪ SCHOLARS REVERSE THE REALITY

Whatever the case may be, the accusation was raised against the Imãmiyyah by their adversaries that the Imãmiyyah, in their formative days and during the times that immediately followed, limited themselves and their beliefs within the literally prescribed boundaries of the Holy Qur’ãn and the *Sunnah*, and did

163-4; see also *al-Biḥãr*, vol.77, p.318, and the commentary of Ibn Abi 'l-Ḥadīd, vol.6, pp.413-5.

[56] *Faḍlu 'l-i‘tizãl wa dhikru 'l-Mu‘tazilah*, p.163.

[57] *Sharḥu 'l-uṣūli 'l-khamsah*, p.268.

not cross over into intellectual fields by relying on reason as a basis for explaining the faith and its directives, or resorting to it in demonstrating the truth, rejecting the objections of its enemies, and showing the falsity of their proofs.

However, the adversaries of the Imãmiyyah did not stop at that; rather, they went on to accuse the Imãmiyyah of being, before their joining the Mu'tazilah:

1. Clear proponents of anthropomorphism and corporealism;
2. Not upholders of Justice as a religious principle having special attributes and requirements;
3. Unaware of the precise differences and theoretical discussions pertaining to Unicity and Justice – which I pointed out in a general way during the discussion about the beliefs of the Imãmiyyah – and unaware of the difference between Attributes of Essence and Attributes of Action, for example, since they had not yet resorted to intellectual investigations which lead to the clarification of these critical fundamentals and the establishment of these particulars;
4. And upholders, even fierce upholders, of predestination.

Abu 'l-Ḥusayn al-Khayyãṭ al-Muʻtazilī stated:

> As for the totality of the teaching of the Rãfiḍah, it is: that Allãh has a physique, an image, and a limit; He is in motion and at rest, draws near and moves away, is lightened and weighed down . . . This is Rãfiḍī Unicity in its entirety, save for a small group of them who associated with the Muʻtazilah and believed in Unicity, . . . and these the Rãfiḍah expelled and washed their hands of. As for their *shaykh*s, like Hishãm ibn Sãlim, Shayṭãnu 'ṭ-Ṭãq, ʻAlī ibn Maytham, Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam, ʻAlī ibn Manṣūr, and as-Sakkãk, their belief is what I have related concerning them.[58]

McDermott says, on the authority of Ibn Taymiyyah, that the

[58] *al-Intiṣãr wa 'r-radd ʻalã Ibnu 'r-Rawandī al-mulḥid,* p.14.

doctrine of Divine Justice was taken up by the later writers of the Imãmiyyah, like al-Mufīd (336/948–413/1022), al-Mūsawī (ash-Sharīf al-Murtaḍã [355/966–436/1044]), and al-Karãjikī (*c* 369/980–449/1057), and had little influence on their predecessors in the Imãmiyyah. On this basis, McDermott maintains that al-Khayyãṭ points to the presence of a minority connected with the Mu‘tazilah and influenced by their beliefs, just as al-Ash‘arī mentions in his writings. McDermott gives the Nawbakhtiyyīn, who existed around the end of the third century (the beginning of the tenth century AD) as an example.[59]

> al-Mufīd was heir to a double legacy: that of the early Imãmite theologians – notably the Nawbakhtīs, who were in contact with Mu‘tazilite thought from the latter part of the third century of the Hijrah, and the traditionist school of Qum represented by Ibn Bãbūyah al-Qummī [aṣ-Ṣadūq].[60]

But a disciple of Ibn Taymiyyah, Shamsu 'd-Dīn adh-Dhahabī (673/1274–748/1348) anticipated what his colleague narrated, and said:

> Since the end of the year 370 [980] up to our own time the Rãfiḍah and the Mu‘tazilah have befriended each other like brothers.[61]

However Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalãnī does not accept this definition of history, and states:

> It is not as he says, but rather they ceased being brothers from the time of al-Ma’mūn (the ‘Abbãsid caliph [170/786 – caliph 198/813 – d. 218/833]),[62]

I shall pass over all these remarks, and concern myself only with the examination of what they are founded upon. It all goes

---

[59] *The Theology of ash-Shaikh al-Mufīd*, pp.2-3.
[60] *Ibid.*, p.395.
[61] *Mīzãnu 'l-i‘tidãl*, vol.3, p.149.
[62] *Lisãnu 'l-mīzãn*, vol.4, p.248.

back to what these adversaries related on the authority of some of the Imãmī scholars, and the predecessors of their Traditionists and theologians, like those al-Khayyãṭ names, concerning the doctrine of blatant corporealism and anthropomorphism, and how they wound up on the brink of idiocy and obscenity.

In doing so I am motivated by the endeavour to uncover the truth, and more importantly, by my belief in Islam and what it enjoins upon faithful Muslims who heed words when they are spoken, who listen to all sides of the story and then pick the best, who judge fairly and without personal bias, who speak the truth even when it goes against them, and adhere to the word of Allãh: *O you who believe! Be steadfast witnesses to Allãh in equity, and do not allow hatred for any people to seduce you, and cause you to act unjustly. Act justly, for that is closer to your duty. Be dutiful to Allãh, for Allãh is informed of what you do* (al-Mdãidah, 5:8). Faithful to all this, I shall examine some of these charges in a general way via a study restricted to the two Hishãms, Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam and Hishãm ibn Sãlim. I shall not venture beyond them, and on the results of this inquiry about them judge others who are like them.

* * * * *

Before beginning, however, I shall summarize the main points:

i) By its very nature, Imãmī *ḥadīth* can only accept that those who believe in them must follow those propositions upon which the Imãmiyyah are generally agreed, and the later Imãmiyyah were here only following previous generations. These generally agreed positions have been previously pointed out in summary form.

ii) Unlike the situation with the Imãmiyyah, there occured a split among the non-Imãmīs into those who submitted to the *ḥadīth* which reached them, and who accepted them without any commentary or interpretation, and out of which those who were

called the *muḥaddithūn* developed; and into those who did not accept them absolutely, such as the Mu‘tazilah, whether we accept the accusation by their opponents that they were unbelievers in the *sunnah*, or accept that, as they themselves said, they were unbelievers in those *ḥadīth* that were fabricated – because they did not accord with their beliefs – and that they interpreted other *ḥadīth* to accord with their beliefs. Between these two camps there arose a bitter controversy, with accusations of heresy and going beyond the bounds of religion, even sometimes reaching physical confrontation. However, this kind of dispute never arose among the Imãmiyyah at all, not even to the smallest degree. This has already been attributed to the fact that Imãmī *ḥadīth* did not give rise to such splits, and clearly demonstrated Imãmī beliefs so that such a split could not occur.

iii) We have already pointed out that the *kalãm* school among the non-Imãmīs is really represented by the Mu‘tazilites, not the Ash‘arites. Investigation reveals that the latter had as their aim to harmonize the intellectual procedures of the Mu‘tazilī school with the beliefs of the *muḥaddithūn*. They did have recourse to investigation, though this was not a position sanc-tioned by their *ḥadīth*, and they found nothing in the *sunnah* to authorize their interpretation and which could support their claim to be interpreting the *sunnah* by the *sunnah*. They were obliged not to reject the *sunnah* so that they would not be accused of depending solely on interpretation as the Mu‘tazilah were.

iv) The Imãmiyyah did not blindly follow the Mu‘tazilah in those opinions on which they agreed, but were only following their Imãms in these beliefs. The Imãms preceded the Mu‘tazilah both historically and in status, and so one cannot say that they were taught by them.

v) The Mu‘tazilah themselves agreed that they took their basic positions – *tawḥīd* and *‘aql* – from Amīr al-Mu’minīn, ‘Alī ibn

Abī Ṭãlib, peace be upon him, through *isnãd* which were trustworthy for them; and ‘Alī, peace be upon him, was the first of the Shī‘ī Imãms. The Imãmiyyah paid more attention to the evidence of his teachings than did the Mu‘tazilah, and we have already given an example of this. So, if it is incorrect to say that the Mu‘tazilah borrowed from the Imãmiyyah, surely it is, in fact, all the more incorrect to say that the Imãmiyyah bor-rowed from them.

15
HISHÃM IBN AL-ḤAKAM: SOME ASPECTS OF HIS PERSONALITY

Abū Muḥammad, Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam al-Kindī (their client) al-Kūfī, then al-Baghdãdī (*c* 105/723–189/805), *shaykh* of the Imãmī theologians and their leader, was born in Kūfah, and grew up in Wãsiṭ – both cities in Iraq – and then returned to Kūfah and lived there. He had a business there, and one in Baghdad, and then he moved to Baghdad in the year 179/796, and lived there without interruption. Hishãm met the Imãms aṣ-Ṣãdiq and al-Kãẓim, peace be upon them, and outlived al-Kãẓim, but was unable to meet ar-Riḍã, peace be upon them. The scholars of the Imãmiyyah said of him: "He was a trustworthy source of *ḥadīth*, of excellent scholarship in his school, a *faqīh*, and a theologian, . . . well versed in the art of theology, ready to answer. Praises of him are related on the authority of the Imãms aṣ-Ṣãdiq, al-Kãẓim, ar-Riḍã, and al-Jawãd, peace be upon them, . . . and they extolled him with abundant commendations."[63] Ibnu 'n-Nadīm described him similarly.[64]

[63] al-Mufīd, *al-Fuṣūlu 'l-mukhtãrah*, vol.1, p.28; aṭ-Ṭūsī, *al-Fihrist*, pp.203-4; an-Najãshī, pp.304-5; Ibn Shahrãshūb, *Ma‘ãlimu 'l-‘ulamã'*, p.115; al-‘Allãmah al-Ḥillī, *Khulãṣatu 'l-aqwãl*, p.178; and concerning the authority

The Shaykh al-Mufīd said: "Of his rank and stature, it was reported by Abū ‘Abdillãh Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad, peace be upon them, that he came to him in Minã while he was a boy, his beard just beginning to grow. There were Shī‘ī *shaykh*s like Ḥumrãn ibn A‘yan, Qays al-Mãṣir, Yūnus ibn Ya‘qūb, Abū Ja‘far al-Aḥwal [Mu'minu 'ṭ-Ṭãq], and Hishãm ibn Sãlim in his company, and he elevated him above all of them. All the others were older than him, and when Abū ‘Abdillãh, peace be upon him, noticed what he had done was unbearable to his follow-ers, he said: 'He assists us with his heart, his tongue, and his hand.'"[65]

Ibn Shahrãshūb states the equivalent and adds:

> [aṣ-Ṣãdiq], peace be upon him, said: 'Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam is a pioneer of our truth, the driving force of our doctrine, the bulwark of our sincerity, the defender against the falsehood of our enemies; he who follows him follows us, and he who is opposed to him and deviates from him is our enemy and deviates from us.'[66]

Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam was a theologian, strong in theology, proficient in argument and debate, quick-witted, with a strong memory, a deep knowledge, extensive education, multi-faceted, highly active and a competitor in debate. He was in contact with all those who developed opinions and were theologians of Muslim and non-Muslim sects; he argued with them, discussed with them, and moreover, befriended them, to the point where he set an example with his friendship and friendliness towards who-ever befriended him, even if their views were opposed to his.

---

of all those who wrote biographies of him, see: *Mu‘jam rijãli 'l-ḥadīth*, vol.19, p.331.

[64] *al-Fihrist*, pp.203-4.

[65] *al-Fuṣūlu 'l-mukhtãrah*, vol.1, p.28; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.10, pp.295-6; see the *ḥadīth* in *al-Kãfī*, vol.l, pp.171-3, nos.433/4, and in many other sources of *ḥadīth*.

[66] *Ma‘ãlimu 'l-‘ulamã'*, p.115; *Mu‘jam rijãli 'l-ḥadīth*, vol.19, p.334.

This aspect of the character of Hishãm is of vital importance in understanding his personality. One of the people he befriended, and for whom his friendship set an example, was ‘Abdullãh ibn Yazīd al-Fazãrī al-Kūfī, the Ibãḍī theologian. He and his followers were of the Khãrijī sect, which came closest to the Ahlu 's-Sunnah.[67] The Ibãḍiyyah were a Khãrijī sect who took their teachings from them.[68] He was one of the greatest Khãrijī theologians and writers; they cite his books as: *Kitãbu 't-Tawḥīd*, *Kitãb ‘ala 'l-Mu‘tazilah*, and *Kitãbu 'r-radd ‘ala 'r-Rãfiḍah*.[69]

‘Abdullãh ibn Yazīd al-Ibãḍī was one of the best friends of Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam, and was a business partner with him.[70]

al-Jãḥiẓ makes them out to have been the best of opponents, between whom there was no severity, no harshness, and no enmity, . . . and they ended up as companions after associating and sharing company . . .They were improved in their adver-sity by what came of their cooperation in all their trading.[71]

‘Abdullãh ibn Yazīd al-Ibãḍī was in Kūfah, where his companions debated with him and learned from him. He was a cobbler in partnership with Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam, who was his senior . . . and his Rãfiḍī companions debated with him and learned from him. Both of them were in the same shop, as we say of opposition in schools of at-Tasharrī [the belief of ash-Shurãt, i.e. the Khawãrij] and ar-Rafḍ. There never passed between them any abuse or offense, as knowledge, the judgement of reason, the requirements of the religious law, and the

[67] Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Fiṣal*, vol.2, p.112.

[68] Ibn Ḥajar, *Lisãnu 'l-mīzãn*, vol.3, p.378.

[69] al-Ash‘arī, *Maqãlatu 'l-Islãmiyyīn*, vol.1, p.186; Ibnu 'n-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p.233; ash-Shahristãnī, *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal*, vol.1, p.137; al-Baghdãdī, *Hadiyyatu 'l-‘ãrifīn*, vol.1, p.446.

[70] *Kamãlu 'd-dīn*, vol.2, p.363; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.48, p.198.

[71] al-Jãḥiẓ, *al-Bayãn wa 't-tabyīn*, vol.l, pp.46-47; ar-Rãghib, *Muḥãḍarãtu 'l-udabã'*, vol.2, p.7.

rules of debate and procedure require.[72]

This special characteristic of Hisham induced most of those who differed with him in belief to associate with him immediately, since those connected with him were not exposed to dangers, nor did they fear any discourtesy or betrayal from him, or any infringement of companionable behaviour or the proprities of debate. Ibn Qutaybah relates:

> A heretic came to Hishãm, and said to him: 'I will say two things: I am aware of your impartiality and I am not afraid of your dissention.' Then he began to dispute with him, and Hishãm interrupted him quickly, and gave him a satisfactory answer.[73]

What we have presented about the character of Hishãm demands that we reinterpret the relationship of Abū Shãkir ad-Dayṣãnī – a renowned atheist – with Hishãm to one of friendship and companionship between them based on a relationship of controversy, inquiry, and discussion of their differences of opinion and belief. Perhaps Abū Shãkir asked him to seek permission for him to visit the Imãm aṣ-Ṣãdiq, peace be upon him,[74] and perhaps they quarrelled, and the discussion wound up at a point where Hishãm no longer had an answer, as Hishãm tells us, when he says that he met with aṣ-Ṣãdiq, peace be upon him, in Madīnah, and learnt the answer from him, and then met Abū Shãkir in Kūfah and told it to him, and the latter said: "This came from the Ḥijãz."[75]

Nevertheless, this high character was transformed by his adversaries into slander and defamation. al-Khayyãṭ says, in reply to those who accused the Mu‘tazilah of taking some of their ideas from ad-Dayṣãnī:

---

[72] *Murūju 'dh-dhahab*, Paris offset, vo1.5, pp.443-11.
[73] *‘Uyūnu 'l-akhbãr*, vol.2, p.154.
[74] *at-Tawḥīd*, p.290; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.3, p.50.
[75] *al-Kãfī*, vol.1, pp.128-9, nos.266/9; *at-Tawḥīd*, p.133.

> Rather, the one accused of the doctrine of the Dayṣãniyyah is the *shaykh* of the Rãfiḍah, their scholar, Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam, a known companion of Abū Shãkir ad-Dayṣãnī . . .[76]

16
HIS THEOLOGICAL PERSONALITY AND INTELLECTUAL ACTIVITIES

Hishãm's connections with theologians and leaders of sects increased after he took over leadership of the Barmakid debating group. After the caliph Hãrūn arrested the Imãm Mūsã ibn Ja‘far in the year 179/795, Hishãm was forced to emigrate to Baghdad for an indefinite time and to take refuge with Yaḥyã ibn Khãlid al-Barmakī (120/738–190/805), the famous ‘Abbãsid minister, and seek his protection. He eventually became, as the biographers state, 'devoted to Yaḥyã ibn Khãlid al-Barmakī, and led his sessions in theology and inquiry.'[77]

> Yaḥyã ibn Khãlid had a *majlis* in his home, which was attended by theologians from all the religious sects and creeds on Sunday, and they argued with one another about their beliefs, and raised objections against each other.[78]

It was natural that this theological debating group, which convened weekly in the presence of the most powerful man in the state after the Caliph, should have been organized and presided over by Hishãm. This is the meaning of their statement 'and he led his sessions in theology and inquiry.' It enabled him to come into contact with the majority of those whose normal circumstances would not have permitted them to meet a

---

[76] *al-Intiṣãr wa 'r-radd ‘alã Ibni 'r-Rawandī al-mulḥid*, p.37.
[77] aṭ-Ṭūsī, *al-Fihrist*, p.204; Ibnu 'n-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, pp.223, 224; *Majma‘u 'r-rijãl*, vol.6, p.233; *Lisãnu 'l-mīzãn*, vol.6, p.194.
[78] *Kamãlu 'd-dīn*, vol.2, p.362; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.48, p.179.

distinguished theologian like Hishãm, who would listen to their views and arguments, let them debate with one another, and then supervise the procedure of inquiry, and evaluate the arguments and give the correct view. al-Mas‘ūdī tells of one such session:

> Yaḥyã ibn Khãlid ibn Barmak, a man of knowledge and discernment, and upholder of discussion and the giving of opinion, used to bring together many discussants and holders of opinion from the *mutakallim*s of Islam and other thinkers and sectarians. Yaḥyã said to them one day when they had gathered at his house: 'You have had many discussions about latency (*kumūn*), manifestation (*ẓuhūr*), and eternity and beginning in time (*al-qadam wa 'l-ḥudūth*), refutation and assertion, motion and rest, conjunction and separation, existence and non-existence, bodies and accidents (*jism wa ‘araḍ*), confirming and refuting, denying and affirming God's attributes, capacity and action, substance, quantity, quality, relation, generation and corruption. [You have discussed] whether the Imãmate is by divine delegation (*naṣṣ*) or by election (*ikhtiyãr*), and the rest of the things brought up in *kalãm* in its principles and derived matters. So now start your discussions about love.'

There are similar descriptions of many subjects of discussion, and then Mas‘ūdī mentions the names of those who participated: "‘Alī ibn al-Haytham who was an Imãmī among the famous Shī‘ī *mutakallim*s." He is the first that he mentions, and the second is "Abū Mãlik al-Ḥaḍramī, who was a Khãrijite", but this person was an Imãmī *mutakallim*.[79] The third person is "Muḥammad ibn al-Hudhayl al-‘Allãf, who was the leader of the Baṣran Mu‘tazilah", and the fourth is "Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam al-Kūfī, the leader of the Imãmiyyah in his time, a master of the science [of *kalãm*] in his age." The fifth is

[79] See *Uṣūlu 'l-Kãfī*, "Kitãbu 't-Tawḥīd", Introduction, no.19.

"Ibrãhīm ibn Sayyãr an-Naẓẓãm, a Mu‘tazilī who was one of those who held opinions among the Baṣrans of his age". The sixth is "‘Alī ibn Manṣūr, an Imãmī who was one of those Shī‘ī who held opinions, and was a companion of Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam." The seventh is "Mu‘tamir ibn Sulaymãn, a Mu‘tazilī, one of the leaders whom they followed." The eighth is "Bishr ibn al-Mu‘tamir, a Mu‘tazilī, the leader of the Baghdãdīs, the teacher of those who held opinions and were *mutakallim*s among them, like Ja‘far ibn Ḥarb, Ja‘far ibn Mubashshir [in Maynard's edition: Muntashshir], and other *mutakallim*s of Baghdad." The ninth is "Thumãmah ibn Ashras, a Mu‘tazilī." The tenth is "as-Sakkãl [read: Sakkãk], an Imãmī, and a com-panion of Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam." And more are mentioned.[80]

I will restrict myself here to pointing out specifically those Mu‘tazilīs who mentioned that Hishãm met with them, and not others.

1. Abū ‘Uthmãn, ‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd at-Taymī al-Baṣrī (80/699–144/761), the second of the two pioneers and propagandists of the Mu‘tazilah. Hishãm met him in the mosque at Baṣrah, and disputed with him on the subject of the Imãmate. The victory in this dispute went to Hishãm who 'ripped him apart', as they put it.[81]

2. ‘Abdu 'r-Raḥmãn ibn Kaysãn, Abū Bakr al-Aṣam al-Baṣrī (d. 200/816), a distinguished Mu‘tazilī, who held a high position among them. But al-Aṣam was a *nãṣibī* Mu‘tazilī who detested the Commander of the Faithful, peace be upon him: 'and he rejected his Imãmate',[82] 'and in him there was a hatred of ‘Alī,

[80] *Murūju 'dh-dhahab*, *Livre des prairies d'or*, vol.6, pp.368-76, Beirut ed., vol.3, pp.370-2.

[81] *al-Kãfī*, vol.1, pp.169-71, nos.432/3; al-Kishshī, pp.271-3; al-Murtaḍã, *al-Amãlī*, vol.1, pp.176-7; al-Mas‘ūdī, *Murūju 'dh-dhahab*, Paris edition, vol.7, pp.234-6; and many other sources.

[82] ash-Shahristãnī, vo1.1, p.31.

the Commander of the Faithful, peace be upon him, and for this reason he is disgraced.[83] His motives in rejecting ‘Alī's Imãmate – he meant that ‘Alī was not the fourth caliph, not that he was not the *imãm* in the Imãmī sense of the term[84] – and in holding his opinion about who had murdered ‘Alī[85] demonstrate his hostile attitude towards him. 'Regarding ‘Alī and Mu‘ãwiyah, he maintained beliefs, which placed Mu‘ãwiyah in a better position than ‘Alī.'[86] al-Qãḍī ‘Abdu 'l-Jabbãr al-Mu‘tazilī and Ibnu 'l-Murtaḍã az-Zaydī state that 'what our followers detest about him . . . is his aversion to ‘Alī, peace be upon him.' From Ibnu 'l-Murtaḍã: 'He displayed a great preju-dice against the Commander of the Faithful, and, our followers say, he was put to the test in an argument with Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam, and he exaggerated this and that.'[87] To understand his stance concerning the Imãmate of the Commander of the Faithful, peace be upon him, one would have to consult what is contained in Bishr ibn al-Mu‘tamar (d. 210/825), a distinguished Mu‘tazilī: *Kitãbu 'r-radd ‘ala 'l-Aṣam fi 'l-imãmah*, and al-Aṣam: *Kitãbu 'r-radd ‘alã Hishãm fi 't-tashbīh* and *Kitãbu 'l-jãmi‘ ‘ala 'r-Rãfiḍah*.[88] Regarding someone who is overcome with adversity and stubbornness to the point where what he says about ‘Alī, peace be upon him, is not approved of by his co-sectarians, should one suppose that he would stick to truth and fairness in what he says about Hishãm and the Rãfiḍah?

3. Muḥammad ibn al-Hudhayl al-‘Abdī, their client, Abu 'l-

---

[83] Ibnu 'n-Nadīm, p.214.

[84] *Maqãlãtu 'l-Islãmiyyīn*, vol.2, p.133; ash-Shahristãnī, vol.1, pp.31, 72-73.

[85] *Maqãlãtu 'l-Islãmiyyīn*, vol.2, pp.130-1.

[86] al-Baghdãdī, *Uṣūlu 'd-dīn*, pp.270, 287, 291.

[87] al-Qãḍī ‘Abdu 'l-Jabbãr, *Faḍlu 'l-i‘tizãl wa ṭabaqãti 'l-Mu‘tazilah*, p.267; Ibnu 'l-Murtaḍã, *al-Munyah wa 'l-amal*, p.156. The only explanation I can find for these words is that the escalation of enmity between them forced each of them to exaggerate their opinion and forsake his school.

[88] See, respectively, Ibnu 'n-Nadīm, pp.185 and 214.

Hudhayl al-‘Allãf al-Baṣrī (135/753–235/850). ash-Shahristãnī said:

> Debates between [Hishãm] and Abu 'l-Hudhayl took place on theology, some of them concerned anthropomorphism, and some the attachment of God's knowledge.[89]

al-Mas‘ūdī recounts one of the discussions, and says at the end of it: "Abu 'l-Hudhayl fell silent, and did not come forth with an answer."[90] But Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalãnī distorted the words of al-Mas‘ūdī – and I would be surprised if it were unintentional – when he said in his biography of Abu 'l-Hudhayl: "al-Mas‘ūdī mentions an argument between him and Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam, the Rãfiḍī, and that Abu 'l-Hudhayl defeated Hishãm in it."[91]

4. Ibrãhīm ibn Sayyãr, Abū Isḥãq an-Naẓẓãm al-Baṣrī (*c* 160/776–231/845). His Mu‘tazilī biographers say: "When an-Naẓẓãm had left for *ḥajj*, on his return he set out for Kūfah, where he met Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam and others, and they discussed the fine points of theology."[92]

The history of this meeting leaves no doubt that it took place prior to the year 179/796, in which Hishãm emigrated from Kūfah to Baghdad and took up residence there. an-Naẓẓãm was then not more than twenty, and, if the story is true, no doubt he wanted to discuss questions and controversies along the lines of those, which pass between a teacher and a student. The young an-Naẓẓãm, when he met Hishãm, questioned him on the fine points of theology, and this is proof of an-Naẓẓãm's intelli-

---

[89] *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal*, vol.1, pp.30, 184.

[90] *Murūju 'dh-dhahab*, vol.7, pp.232-3.

[91] *Lisãnu 'l-mīzãn*, vol.5, p.414.

[92] al-Qãḍī ‘Abdu 'l-Jabbãr, *Faḍlu 'l-i‘tizãl wa dhikru 'l-Mu‘tazilah*, p.254; Ibnu 'l-Murtaḍã, *al-Munyah wa 'l-amal*, p.149; Dr. ‘Abdu 'r-Raḥmãn Badawī, *Madhãhibu 'l-Is1ãmiyyīn*, vol.1, p.127, but he has misunderstood the words of Ibnu 'l-Murtaḍã which he has quoted.

gence and his ability to deduce questions on theological details and his understanding of the complicated answers given by prominent theologians like Hishãm and others. Perhaps one of these discussions is what al-Maqdīsī relates,[93] that is, that it was not a discussion or argument in the precise meaning of these words, but rather that an-Naẓẓãm only put forth questions as any student would, and, moreover, did not raise objections concerning what he heard, except at the level of a student questioning a teacher, and that Hishãm answered, without receiving any objections or arguments.

Nevertheless, an argument took place between him and Hishãm surrounding the immortality of the People of Paradise (*ahlu 'l-jannah*) in Paradise, and the everlasting nature of their felicity, since an-Naẓẓãm denied this; and Hishãm defeated him in it.[94]

However, what I must point out is that Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam was not a master of philosophical ideas, especially those of the Greeks, which had recently reached the Islamic lands, and which aroused great concern among those on whom authority and power had been conferred, especially the Barmakids and after them those who continued the 'Abbãsid caliphate. The biographers of Hishãm relate that Yaḥyã al-Barmakī loved Hishãm, sheltered him as his own, and that his care for him knew no bounds, because 'Yaḥyã ibn Khãlid al-Barmakī had enjoined Hishãm to attack the philosophers . . .'[95] They say that this is one of the reasons which induced al-Barmakī to induce the caliph Hãrūn ar-Rashīd to support Hishãm.[96]

---

[93] *al-Bad' wa 't-tãrīkh*, vol.2, pp.123-4.

[94] al-Kishshī, pp.274-5; *Majma'u 'r-rijãl*, vol.6, p.228.

[95] al-Kishshī, p.258; *Majma'u 'r-rijãl*, vol.6, p.218; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.48, p.189.

[96] Hishãm wrote a *Kitãbu 'r-radd 'alã Arisṭãṭãlīs fi 't-tawḥīd* (Refutation of Aristotle on Unicity); see aṭ-Ṭūsī, *al-Fihrist*, p.204; an-Najãshī, p.305; Ibnu 'n-Nadīm, p.224; *Ma'ãlimu 'l-'ulamã'*, p.115; *Majma'u 'r-rijãl*, vol.6, pp.233, 234; *adh-Dharī'ah*, vol.10, p.183.

His pupils inherited this trait of Hishãm's after him. Indeed, we find in an index of books, which was written by the famous Imãmī theologian and scholar al-Faḍl ibn Shãdhãn al-Azdī an-Naysãbūrī (*c* 195/811–260/873) books which refute the philosophers, and al-Faḍl traces their authorship back to the point where they reach Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam.[97]

17
THE MUʻTAZILĪS WHOM HISHÃM MET AND THEIR DISCUSSIONS

I have been concerned with Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam, and after him with Hishãm ibn Sãlim, only because adversaries of the Imãmiyyah made him the crack through which they attacked the Imãmiyyah with all their might, and directed at him, and through him at the Imãmiyyah, every possible defamation, derogation, and disparagement, prejudice and malediction. They attributed to him what was correct – albeit infrequently –and, more often, what was incorrect; and, moreover, they attributed contradictory opinions to him. The amazing thing about these adversaries is that we find enmity and hatred flung back and forwards between them since the birth of the sects they arose from up to our own day, may Allãh desire that it cease, for they are mutually antagonistic adversaries, one against the other, in the strongest sense of antagonism and adversity, all of them attributing to the other what a Muslim does not attribute to someone he holds to be a brother in the religion. Nevertheless, we find that enmity and adversity have united them against the Imãmiyyah in general and Hishãm in particular, and so they befriend one another, and support one another.

[97] See the biography of al-Faḍl ibn Shãdhãn in the forward to the English translation of "Kitãbu 't-Tawḥīd" of *al-Kãfī*.

The hostility towards Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam originated from the Mu‘tazilah; they were the ones whom Hishãm had opposed in argument, those who attributed to him what was attributed to them, as will be mentioned below. The adversaries of the Mu‘tazilah, people like ‘Abdu 'l-Qãhir al-Baghdãdī, al-Malaṭī, Ibn Ḥazm, al-Isfarãyīnī, Ibn Taymiyyah, his colleague adh-Dhahabī, and his student Ibnu 'l-Qayyim al-Jawziyyah, Ibn Kathīr and Ibn Ḥajar accused them at the very least of extreme innovation and deceit; they did not trust them or what they narrated, they said of them that they had invented falsehoods and a new religion for themselves, and that they were not bound by the laws of the *sharī‘ah*, but rather overstepped them. This applied to many of them in general, and to many of the distinguished Mu‘tazilah in particular. They passed on to unbelief or atheism, and departed from the religious community who cursed them and washed their hands of them, but all of whom accepted what the Mu‘tazilah attributed to the Imãmiyyah and Hishãm and theologians like him. They strayed from the religion except when they attacked the Imãmiyyah, and were feeble liars except when they attributed an infamy to the Imãmiyyah or spoke of them degradingly. I will not extend the discussion to what they said about Wãṣil ibn ‘Aṭã’, ‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd, Abu 'l-Hudhayl, Thumãmah ibn Ashras, an-Naẓẓãm, and others like them among the leading personalities of the Mu‘tazilah and their scholars. What is worse than this is that they followed and promoted the methods of their brothers-in-law the Mu‘tazilah, who were their adversaries in dogma, and distorted and changed, discarded and added, perfected – as they claim – what they found tacking in the Mu‘tazilī armoury, and patched up any weakness they stumbled on. I have quoted examples of this above, and a few more will follow. I do not intend in saying this that these observations should refute what they wrote about the characteristics of their masters – I have previously stated that I have given up

this kind of hope. I have said what I have said by way of introduction to some of the ideas of Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam and the views attributed to him.

18
THE MUʻTAZILĪS FOUND FAULT WITH HISHÃM AND FABRICATED FALSE POSITIONS FOR HIM, THE ANTI-MUʻTAZILĪS AGREED WITH THEM HERE BUT NOT ALWAYS ELSEWHERE

I shall not be led here to speak in detail of every idea they attributed to Hishãm; it is possible for the reader to refer to what I have said about Muqãtil ibn Sulaymãn and Dãwūd al-Jawãribī, which are clear examples of what they said about Hishãm. I will be content here to clarify the points, which call upon us to refute an imputation like that, directed at Hishãm.

Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam was, it is said, in the beginning, a Jahmī, a follower of Jahm ibn Ṣafwãn (d. 128/745), and then renounced him after joining the Imãm aṣ-Ṣãdiq, peace be upon him, and his error had been made clear to him.[98]

Jahm ibn Ṣafwãn, as is understood from his sect, was opposed to corporeality and anthropomorphism to the greatest extent; concerning the attributes of Allãh, his school was a Muʻtazilah school when it first emerged. He was a contemporary of Wãṣil ibn ʻAṭã' and ʻAmr ibn ʻUbayd, the two founders of the Muʻtazilah, and they held nothing against him except the doctrine of the impermanence of Paradise and Hell and that felicity and chastisement were not eternal. They held against him his belief in *irjã'* (postponement of judgement about whether the grave sinner was a believer or an unbeliever), not

---

[98] al-Kishshī, pp.256-7; *Majmaʻu 'r-rijãl*, vol.6, pp.216-7; Ibnu 'n-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, al-Istiqãmah ed., Cairo, p.257 (Tajaddud ed., Tehran, [to which refernce is usually made] p.224), *al-Manãqib*, vol.4, p.244.

the doctrine of *al-manzilah bayna 'l-manzilatayn* (the state of the sinner as intermediate between that of a believer and an unbeliever), which was their doctrine concerning the grave sinner.[99]

However, the principle point of difference between him and the Mu‘tazilah as a whole was his belief in predestination, and their belief in free will, since among the later Mu‘tazilah there were some who believed in *irjã’* and some who believed in the impermanence of Paradise and Hell. However all of them agreed on the doctrine of free will and refuted predestination. For this reason ash-Shahristãnī counts him among those who 'emerged from the Mu‘tazilah in the days of Naṣr ibn Sayyãr and made his innovation from the Mu‘tazilī position on pre-destination clear.'[100]

One of the views of Jahm, which influenced Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam, was his statement about Allãh, praise be to Him: 'He is a body unlike [other] bodies', as will be shown. One of Jahm ibn Ṣafwãn's doctrines, as al-Ash‘arī relates, was that he believed that 'Allãh is a body,' and went on to say that 'the meaning of "body" is "existent"'.[101] He says the same about Hishãm. From this, he goes on to relate that he believed that 'God's knowledge is incipient: He did not know then He knew'[102] and that he had taken this also from Jahm.[103]

---

99 Ibnu 'l-Murtaḍã, *al-Munyah wa 'l-amal*, pp.23, 107; and see al-Balkhī, *Dhikru 'l-Mu‘tazilah*, p.67; al-Qãḍī ‘Abdu 'l-Jabbãr, *Faḍlu 'l-i‘tizãl*, p.241.

100 *al-Milal wa 'l-niḥal*, vol.1, p.32; see the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new ed., vol.2, p.388, and the *Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam*, p.83, and the references given in both of them.

101 *Maqãlãtu 'l-Islãmiyyīn*, vol.l, p.269; vol.2, p.164.

102 *al-Intiṣãr*, pp.14, 50; *al-Fiṣal*, vol.2, p.126, & vol.4, p.182; *Lisãnu 'l-mīzãn*, vol.6, p.194.

103 ash-Shahristãnī, *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal*, vol.1, p.87; *Nihãyatu 'l-iqdãm*, p.215; *al-Fiṣal*, vol.2, p.126; *al-Mu‘tamad fī uṣūli 'd-dīn*, p.45; Ibn Abi 'l-Ḥadid, vol.11, p.63.

ash-Shahristãnī compares 'Jahm and Hishãm's assertion that knowledge (‘*ulūm*) is not in a location [with respect to Allãh, praise be to Him, because since they spoke of the incipience of His knowledge they made Him a locus for His knowledge, and this contradicts His eternity, which was their doctrine] with the Ash‘ariyyah's assertion that speech (*taklīm*) is not in a location.'[104]

It is mentioned that the famous Mu‘tazilī theologian Abu 'l-Ḥusayn, Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib, al-Baṣrī, al-Ḥanafī (d. 436/1044) adopted Hishãm's view regarding God's knowledge. ash-Shahristãnī states: "He inclined towards the school of Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam concerning the belief that things were not known before they existed."[105]

But two other views are also reported on the authority of Hishãm which contradict the aforesaid: 'The Creator never ceases to know through His Self, and He knows things after their coming into existence through a knowledge which cannot be said to be either incipient or eternal, and because it is an attribute and the attribute is not ascribed, it is not said about [this knowledge] that it is He or something else. They add that his belief about Power and Life was not like his belief in knowledge, except that he did not believe that they were incipient.'[106]

However, the Shaykh al-Mufīd denied the truth of associating this opinion with Hishãm, and his words follow. What was attributed to Hishãm was his belief in strong compulsion (*al-ijbãru 'sh-shadīd*), which the believers of the *sunnah* did not subscribe to, as Ibn Qutaybah states.[107]

---

[104] *Nihãyatu 'l-iqdãm*, p.245.

[105] *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal*, vol.1, p.85; *Nihãyatu 'l-iqdãm*, p.221.

[106] *Maqãlãtu 'l-Islãmiyyīn*, vol.1, p.268; ash-Shahristãnī, *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal*, vol.1, p.185; *al-Farq bayna 'l-firaq*, p.49; Ibn Abi 'l-Ḥadīd, vol.3, p.219.

[107] *Ta'wīl mukhtalafi 'l-ḥadīth*, p.48; *Lisãnu 'l-mīzãn*, vol.6, p.194.

If this attribution is true and Hishãm followed Jahm in it, as stated above, then he was distinguished from his Mu‘tazilī brothers by his belief in absolute predestination, and their belief in complete choice (*ikhtiyãr*, or *qadar* as their adversaries called it).

In the light of what has been said, what was attributed to Hishãm can be divided into two sections: (a) that which conforms with the beliefs of the Jahmiyyah who preceded him, and this is possibly a correct attribution as long as the narrations are correct, and these are the short examples I have quoted; and (b) the greater portion of what his adversaries attributed to him, and this does not accord with the beliefs of the Jahmiyyah before him, nor those of the Imãmiyyah after him; we have no alternative but to conclude that this was attributed to him calumniously and that it is true that Hishãm may have held a part of these beliefs (this is only supposition with no basis in fact), but that he did not believe them in earnest, as will be shown. It is necessary to point out that Hishãm's Jahmiyyah period was doubtless during his early adolescence, and, moreover, when he was still a juvenile, since when he became an adolescent and still 'the first thing I noticed was his bare cheeks', as has been stated, he did not believe outright in the Imãmate, but rather disputed about it and debated and argued with his adver-saries and critics about it. I think that it is closer to the truth, and more in line with the established facts of Hishãm's life and behaviour, that his connections with the Jahmiyyah were limited to following Jahm ibn Ṣafwãn and some of his ideas, which are the three examples I mentioned earlier which are not incompat-ible with the doctrine of the Imãmate, the requirements of its concommitants, and its defense, and did not involve an association with the Jahmiyyah sect in all its dimensions and extent. Hishãm was not for one day a Jahmī except to a limited extent; he did not follow them in all his ideas and beliefs.

19
SOME OPINIONS INCORRECTLY ATTRIBUTED TO HISHÃM

Past and present scholars of the Imãmiyyah have investigated the ideas, which were attributed to Hishãm, and have defended him and refuted their attribution to him. All of these ideas are summarised with characteristic brevity in that which is cited by the Sharīf al-Murtaḍã, Abu 'l-Qãsim, ʻAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn, ʻAlamu 'l-Hudã, al-Mūsawī (355/966–436/1044), who said:

> [A]nd as for what Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam is charged with regarding belief in corporeality, the ostensive meaning of what is narrated from him is his doctrine: 'a body unlike bodies.' There is no contradiction in saying that this belief is not anthropomorphism, is not inconsistent with any basic principle (*aṣl*), does not oppose any derived doctrine (*farʻ*), but is an error in expression [since by 'body' the 'existent' is intended, not the material body, as will be mentioned] which depends upon language for its affirmation or denial. Most of our followers say that he brought this up in the course of opposition to the Muʻtazilah, and said to them: "If you say that the Eternal is a thing unlike things, say He is a body unlike bodies." Not everyone who proposes something and asks questions about it is a believer in it or upholds it. It is possible that the intention behind this statement was to draw out their answer to this question and to understand what they held regarding it, or to reveal their inadequacy in putting forward a satisfactory answer, or for other reasons, which he does not express.
>
> As for the narration that he upheld the view that Allãh is a body having the reality of apparent bodies (*al-ajsãmu 'l-ḥãḍirah*), and the report about the spans (*ashbãr*) of God's

hand attributed to him,[108] we only know of it from the narration of al-Jãḥiẓ on the authority of an-Naẓẓãm, and it contains nothing but an accusation which is clearly unreliable in its expression. The whole matter is evidence that the schools must learn from the mouths of their spokesmen and authorized followers and whoever is reliable in narrating about them, and should not rely on propagandistic adversaries . . . That Hishãm was innocent of this accusation is demonstrated by what is related on the authority of the Imãm aṣ-Ṣãdiq, peace be upon him, in his statement: 'O Hishãm, continue to be supported by the Spirit of Holiness as long as you defend us with your tongue', spoken when the *shaykh*s came to him [this has been narrated from al-Mufīd], and by his words . . .[109] He, peace be upon him, marked him out in matters to do with speculation and proof and urged the people to hasten to face him and debate with him. How can an intelligent person believe this statement that his Lord is seven spans of His own span after what we have mentioned?

As for the incipience of [Divine] knowledge, this is another narration they circulated, and we do not know that the man wrote about it, nor that the account is trustworthy.

As for determinism and [God's] obliging [someone] to do what he is unable [to do], it is something about which we do not know whether it was his opinion.[110]

To these words of ash-Sharīf al-Murtaḍã can be added a few

[108] Hishãm said of his Lord: "He is seven spans [the length] of His own span", this is mentioned in all the non-Imãmī sources (Ibnu 'l-Murtaḍã az-Zaydī al-Mu‘tazilī reduces them by two and gives five spans): *al-Baḥru 'z-zakhkhãr*, vol.1, p.47; *al-Munyah wa 'l-amal*, p.30.

[109] He mentions what was related from Ibn Shahrãshūb above in the first part of the biography of Hishãm.

[110] *ash-Shãfī*, vol.1, pp.83-88.

comments condensed from more extensive discussions:

1. ash-Shahristãnī states:

> This Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam, who had a profound [knowledge] of theology, could not have ignored the objections he made against the Muʻtazilites. [This] man in fact went beyond what he made his adversary admit, while remaining well short of the anthropomorphism, which he professed. This was how he had objected to al-ʻAllãf: 'You say that the Creator knows through knowledge, that His knowledge is His essence, that He shares with incipient [created] things in being a knower through knowledge, that He is distinct from them in that His knowledge is His essence, so He is a knower unlike [other] knowers. So why do you not say that He is a body unlike [other] bodies, a form unlike [other] forms, that He has power unlike [any other] power, and so forth.'[111]

2. The biographers have cited more than thirty books and treatises, which Hishãm wrote. Those which are concerned with Unicity and its aspects are: (1) *Kitãbu 't-Tawḥīd*, (2) *Kitãbu 'l-majãlis fi 't-tawḥīd*, (3) *Kitãbu 'sh-Shaykh wa 'l-ghulãm fi 't-tawḥīd*, (4) *Kitãbu 'r-radd ʻalã Ariṣṭãṭãlīs fi 't-tawḥīd*, (5) *Kitãbu 'd-dalãlãt ʻalã ḥadathi (ḥudūthi) 'l-ajsãm*, (6) *Kitãbu 'r-radd ʻala 'z-zanãdiqah*, (7) *Kitãbu 'r-radd ʻalã aṣḥãbi 'l-ithnayn*, (8) *Kitãbu 'r-radd ʻalã aṣḥãbi 'ṭ-ṭabãyiʻ*,[112] (9) *Kitãb fi 'l-jabr wa 'l-qadar*, (10) *Kitãbu 'l-Qadar*, (11) *Kitabu 'l-Istiṭãʻah*, (12)

---

[111] *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal*, vol.1, p.185, and, citing this, Dr. ʻAlī Sãmī an-Nashshãr, *Nash'atu 'l-fikri 'l-falsafī fi 'l-Islãm*, vol.2, p.220, who, however, does not discuss it.

[112] By whom he had in mind those who held that things exist of themselves and in their existence have no need of God, who is their Creator, this being one of the historical roots of modern materialist thought; they also came in different degrees, from those who were plain and simple materialists – common materialism – and those who were influenced by the thoughts and philosophies of the Greeks, or Buddhist or Hindu beliefs.

Kitãbu 'l-Maʻrifah, (13) *Kitãbu 'l-Alṭãf*, (14) *Kitãbu 'l-Alfãẓ*.[113]

If these ideas were firmly established ideas of Hishãm, then he would have mentioned them in his books, and his Imãmī biographers would have narrated them, and so would those who passed on knowledge and read his works, not one of which has reached us or been alluded to in the accounts of the Imãmiyyah, although some of his ideas are mentioned in their accounts, as will be seen.

In addition, that which adversaries do relate about Hishãm's ideas they say that he said in the course of discussion and debate with his Muʻtazilī adversaries and do not attribute a single one of them to what he wrote in any of his books. If these adversaries had stumbled upon any remnant of such ideas in his books then they would have attributed it to the book itself.

3. The statement of Hishãm: 'a body unlike [other] bodies' was originally one of Jahm ibn Ṣafwãn's ideas, and if Hishãm held it, then he was following Jahm in it, as was stated previously. Perhaps, after the Imãm aṣ-Ṣãdiq, peace be upon him, had turned him away from the Jahmiyyah, Hishãm used it when the Muʻtazilah were disputing with the adversaries of the Jahmiyyah. This statement remained fixed in the minds of his students or other Shīʻah, and when Hishãm came to hold a high position and rank with the Imãms, peace be upon them, and the Imãmiyyah as a whole, the Imãms asked about it, as will be shown. It is not correct for us to refute the honourable word of al-Murtaḍã, that Hishãm used it in the course of debate, employing what comes to us in the way of accounts which emphasize Hishãm's belief in the body.

---

[113] Perhaps this latter was an explanation of the technical terms, which he used or which were used in theology. For all these titles see aṭ-Ṭūsī, *al-Fihrist*, p.204; an-Najãshī, *al-Fihrist*, pp.304-5; Ibnu 'n-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p.224; *Maʻãlimu 'l-ʻulamã'*, p.115; *Majmaʻu 'r-rijãl*, vol.6, pp.233-4; *Hadiyyatu 'l-ʻãrifīn*, vol.2, p.507; and others.

4. Based on my investigation, and within the bounds of the sources I posess – and they are very limited when weighed against those that have perished – I am almost certain, for reasons which there is not enough room here to mention, that Abu 'l-Hudhayl al-ʻAllãf is to be considered the principle source for most of what is attributed to Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam.[114]

As to what is related by others besides Abu 'l-Hudhayl, there are statements showing us that these accounts can be traced back to him, if the narrators are truthful and have not fabricated the narration. For all the narrators the chain of their Muʻtazilī education goes back to him. Abu 'l-Hudhayl taught an-Naẓẓãm, Thumãmah ibn Ashras, an-Numayrī al-Baṣrī (d. 213/828) – one of Hishãm's Muʻtazilī contemporaries –, and Jaʻfar ibn Ḥarb al-Baṣrī, then al-Baghdãdī (177/793–236/850).[115]

an-Naẓẓãm taught Zurqãn, Muḥammad ibn Shaddãd ibn ʻĪsã al-Baṣrī (d. 278/891), the famous author of *Kitãbu 'l-maqãlãt*, which is considered one of the authoritative Islamic reference works concerning treatises and sects,[116] and al-Jãḥiẓ, ʻAmr ibn Baḥr (163/780–255/869).[117] Ibn Qutaybah ad-Dīnawarī, ʻAbdullãh ibn Muslim (213/828–276/889) studied with al-

---

[114] Refer to the account directly from Abu 'l-Hudhayl, *Maqãlãtu 'l-Islãmiy-yīn*, vol.1, pp.103, 257, 258; and on his authority *al-Farq bayna 'l-firaq*, pp.48, 216; and *al-Firaq madhãhabi 'l-Islãmiyyīn*, vol.1, p.127; and from Abu 'l-Hudhayl, *al-Fiṣal*, vol.4, p.184; and on his authority *Minhãju 's-sunnah*, vol.1, p.203; *Lisãnu 'l-mīzãn*, vol.6, p.194; and from Abu 'l-Hudhayl, *Faḍlu 'l-iʻtizãl*, pp.140, 262; *al-Ḥūru 'l-ʻīyn*, p.254; and al-Kirmãnī, *al-Firaqu 'l-Islãmiyyah*, p.44.

[115] Refer to the account of him in *Maqãlãtu 'l-Islãmiyyīn*, vol.1, p.110; *al-Firaq*, p.50; *Minhãju 's-sunnah*, vol.l, p.214.

[116] Refer to the account in *Maqãlãtu 'l-Islãmiyyīn*, vol.1, pp.109, 112; vol.2, p.232; *Minhãju 's-sunnah*, vol.1, p.208; and on the authority of Zurqãn, *al-Ḥūru 'l-ʻīyn*, pp.148-9, 170.

[117] Refer to the account of his (which lacks a chain of authority) in *Maqãlãtu 'l-Islãmiyyīn*, vol.1, pp.104, 268; vol.2, pp.161-2; and on his authority, *al-Firaq*, pp.49, 216.

Jãḥiẓ.[118]

Ja‘far ibn Ḥarb was the teacher of Abu 'l-Ḥusayn al-Khayyãṭ, ‘Abdu 'r-Raḥmãn ibn Muḥammad al-Baghdãdī (d. 300/912), the author of *al-Intiṣãr wa 'r-radd ‘alã Ibnu 'r-Rawandī al-mulḥid*.[119]

al-Khayyãṭ taught al-Ka‘bī al-Balkhī, ‘Abdullãh ibn Aḥmad (273/886–319/931);[120] and Mu‘tazilī *imãm*s who came after these, such as the two Jubbã'īs and the Qãḍī ‘Abdu 'l-Jabbãr, drew from them. al-‘Allãf is reckoned to be the head of the chain in this list.

Ibnu 'r-Rawandī accused al-Jãḥiz of having gone too far in his opposition to Hishãm, to the extent that he stood shoulder to shoulder with the adversaries of the Commander of the Faithful, peace be upon him, and was 'driven to partisanship and seeking revenge for his two teachers in the person of Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam'.[121] Ibnu 'r-Rawandī does not specify who the two teachers were; without a doubt, one of them was an-Naẓẓãm,[122] and it is clear to anyone who traces the thread back that the

---

[118] See his reference to al-Jãḥiẓ in *‘Uyūnu 'l-akhbãr*, vol.3, pp.199, 216, 249; and see also what he states about Hishãm in *Ta'wīl mukhtalifi 'l-ḥadīth*, p.48, and *Lisãnu 'l-mīzãn*, vol.6, p.194.

[119] Refer to what he explicitly attributes to Hishãm in *al-Intiṣãr*, pp.14, 37, 50.

[120] See the account from him in *Maqãlãtu 'l-Islãmiyyīn*, vol.l, pp.104, 107-8; vol.2, pp.163-4, 231; *al-Firaq*, pp.49, 50; *Minhãju 's-sunnah*, vol.1, pp.207, 208; *al-Firaqu 'l-Islãmiyyah*, pp.44-45; and from al-Ka‘bī, *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal*, vol.1, p.184.

[121] *al-Intiṣãr*, p.103.

[122] Agreeing here with the sources, which give al-Jãḥiẓ as a pupil of an-Naẓẓãm: see *Faḍlu 'l-i‘tizãl*, p.265; *al-Munyah wa 'l-amal*, pp.153, 162; *Tãrīkh Baghdãd*, vol.7, p.97; vol.12, p.213; Ibn Khallikãn, vol.3, p.471; *Mu‘jamu 'l-udabã'*, vol.6, p.57; *Nuzhatu 'l-alibbã'*, p.192; and many other sources. al-Jãḥiẓ amplifies accounts from an-Naẓẓãm, and praises him in his books: refer to the name indexes in *al-Bayãn wa 't-tabyīn, al-Ḥayawãn*, etc.

second is Abu 'l-Hudhayl.[123]

Abu 'l-Hudhayl took revenge on others within the Imãmiyyah, e.g., their theologians Abu 'l-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Ismã‘īl ibn Shu‘ayb ibn Maytham al-Kūfī, then al-Baṣrī, famous among them as ‘Alī ibn Maytham:[124] 'He was one of the prominent theologians among our followers who disputed with Abu 'l-Hudhayl and an-Naẓẓãm, and held sessions and wrote books'.[125] There is also what Ibn Ḥajar narrated from Abu 'l-Qãsim at-Taymī in the "Kitãbu 'l-Ḥujjah": 'He debated with him before the *amīr* of Baṣrah.'[126]

20
THE IMÃMĪ DEFENSE OF HISHÃM

Indeed, there exists in the accounts of the Imãmiyyah the attribution of the doctrine of God's having a body to Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam, and these accounts contributed to the belief being attributed to him; and yet his belief in it is inexplicable.[127] His belief is clearly set forth in a number of places, among them is a Tradition from Yūnus ibn Ẓabyãn, in which he relates Hishãm's belief to the Imãm aṣ-Ṣãdiq, peace be upon him, and says:

> He claims that Allãh is a body, because the matter is twofold: a body and the action of the body. It is not possible

---

[123] *al-Ḥayawãn*, vol.6, p.166.

[124] His report concerning the discussion surrounding Hishãm ibn Sãlim will follow.

[125] an-Najãshī, p.176; *Majma‘u 'r-rijãl*, vo1.4, p.167; and refer to examples of his disputations with Abu 'l-Hudhayl, in which he gained the upper hand, in *al-Fuṣūlu 'l-mukhtãrah*, vol.1, pp.6, 55; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.10, pp.370-2.

[126] Refer to *Lisãnu 'l-mīzãn*, vol.5, pp.265-6, to see what he invented about him.

[127] See *al-Kãfī*, vol.1, p.105, nos.285/6; *at-Tawḥīd*, pp.97, 99; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.3, p.303.

for 'Maker' to have the meaning 'doing', while it is possible for it to have the meaning 'doer'.

Abū ‘Abdillãh, peace be upon him, said:

> Woe to him. He knows that a body is limited and finite, that a form is limited and finite, and if limits are permitted then addition and subtraction are [also] permissible, and if additions and subtractions are permitted, then He is a created being.[128]

There is also a Tradition from Ḥasan ibn ‘Abdi 'r-Raḥmãn al-Ḥimmãnī, who said:

> I said to Abu 'l-Ḥasan Mūsã ibn Ja‘far, peace be upon him, that Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam claimed that God was a body unlike any thing [i.e., a body unlike (other) bodies], Knowing, Hearing, Seeing, posessing Power, Conversing and Speaking; Speech, Power, and Knowledge go together, nothing of them being created. He, peace be upon him, renounced the doctrine of body, because it is limited, and he pointed out that these attributes do not go together, since there are among them those which are attributes of essence, such as Knowledge and Power, and those which are attributes of action, like Conversing and Speech.[129]

It is stated in a Tradition from ‘Alī ibn Abī Ḥamzah:

> I said to Abū ‘Abdillãh, peace be upon him, that I heard Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam relate on your authority that Allãh is a body, eternal and radiant, and that knowledge of Him is necessary, and He bestows [it] upon whoever of His creatures He wishes.[130]

---

[128] *al-Kãfī*, vol.1, p.106, no.287; *at-Tawḥīd*, p.99; *al-Fuṣūl 'l-mukhtãrah*, vol.2, p.285; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.3, p.302; vol.10, p.453. Another tradition on the same subject with a clearer and more detailed explanation about Hishãm ibn Sãlim will be mentioned in his biography.

[129] *al-Kãfī*, vol.1, p.106, no.288; *at-Tawḥīd*, p.100; *al-Iḥtijãj*, vol.2, p.155; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.3, p.295.

[130] *al-Kãfī*, vol.1, p.104, no.282; *at-Tawḥīd*, p.98; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.3, p.301.

However, it is extremely likely that the narrator has confused the words of Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam with what is attributed to Hishãm ibn Sãlim, as will be seen. Whatever the case may be the meaning of the *ḥadīth* is not different from what has been stated previously.

The same statement has been made on Hishãm's authority in books of theological ideas: 'He is a body unlike bodies', and that Hishãm said: 'What I intend by saying "body" is that He is existent, that He is a thing, and that He is self-existent, because whatever exists is either a body or an attribute of bodies.'[131] It has already been said that Hishãm took this statement from Jahm ibn Ṣafwãn.

Hishãm's excuse in this was that he had not come across another term besides 'body', which conveyed the meaning of 'self-existent being'; the error or correctness of this expression is a question of language, not belief, as al-Murtaḍã stated. 'Body' in the Arabic language has a distinctly defined meaning, and it is incorrect to apply another meaning to it unless this meaning is qualified and justifiable.

Hishãm lived at the beginning of an age in which theological and philosophical terms were being coined in the Muslim community, and he was one of those early *mutakallim*s who 'was feeling his way towards an adequate philosophical vocabulary in Arabic', as W. Montgomery Watt has stated.[132]

Perhaps the clue to this harshness on the part of the Imãms peace be upon them, and this manifestly cutting denial of what Hishãm expressed goes back to the fact that 'body', as we have indicated previously, has a clear significance in ordinary speech,

---

[131] *Maqãlãtu 'l-Islãmiyyīn*, vol.1, p.257; vol.2, p.182; and see ‘Alī Sãmī an-Nashshãr, *Nash'atu 'l-fikri 'l-falsafī fi 'l-Islãm*, vol.2, p.230; Sahīr Muḥammad Mukhtãr, *at-Tajsīm ‘inda 'l-Muslimīn*, p.127, and the sources indicated in both of them.

[132] *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought*, Edinburgh, 1973, p.248.

stemming from its meaning in the Arabic language, and that, if Hishãm ascribed 'body' to God and coupled 'unlike bodies' to it, it would almost certainly induce the idea of, or lead the ordinary mind to, corporeality and anthropomorphism, provided 'a body unlike bodies' were interpreted by them in a way close to the interpretation we have related earlier, based on the state-ments of the non-Imãmī Traditionists who believed in corpor-eality, limbs, and the parts of God, but said that He did not resemble in any one of these things anything belonging to a created body, or limbs, or parts. The meaning of their doctrine, even if they did not make it clear, was that Allãh has 'a head unlike heads', and 'a hand unlike hands', and 'an eye unlike eyes', and that He is 'a body unlike bodies' with the word 'body' continuing to carry the same meaning as that which was ordin-arly understood, and not the precise meaning which Hishãm intended and which was elevated above the ordinary level of comprehension, not to mention the comprehension of scholars who were not specialists in the science of theology. Hishãm should not have used the word 'body' without a clear explan-ation of its context. For this reason, the expression suggests corporeality and anthropomorphism in the mind of the listener, even if the speaker who deployed the term did not intend these concepts, especially a theologian like Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam, given the distinguished position he held with the Imãms, peace be upon them, and the indisputable scholarly and religious position he held with their Shīʻī followers.

The following discussion, concerning the debate surrounding Hishãm ibn Sãlim, will bear witness to what we have said, since in it the Imãm, peace be upon him, approves of what Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam and his followers state, but only when the people being addressed are specialists in the science of theology who can distinguish between scholarly terminology and the ordinary meanings of language.

21
THE OPINION OF HISHÃM ON GOD'S BODY BEING UNLIKE OTHER BODIES, AND THE IMÃMĪ POSITION AGAINST HIM

It is appropriate, although perhaps rather surprising, that I should pass on an opinion concerning 'a body unlike bodies' from one of the most stalwart of Muslim scholars, strict and vehement in matters of belief, one of the many who stood by the Qur'ãn and the *Sunnah* in his opinion, inflexible regarding the way they were formulated, and one of the greatest critics of what he saw as innovation and heresy in religion, Abū Muḥammad ʻAlī ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥazm al-Andulusī (384/994–456/1064), who stated:

> If they say to us: You state that Allãh is Living unlike [other] living beings, Knowing unlike [other] knowers, Powerful unlike those who posess power, a thing unlike [other] things, and you do not prohibit the doctrine that He is a body unlike [other] bodies, then it should be said to them, but let Allãh be the judge: Is there not a Text transmitted in the name of the Most High which contains the designation that He is Living, Powerful, and Knowing in the sense that we designate such things? But going no further than the Text is a duty (*farḍ*), and no text has come ascribing a body to Him, and the proof of ascribing a body to him does not stand, rather proof prohibits this ascription. If a text were to come to us which assigned a body to Him, then we would be obliged to believe that; but we would say that he is unlike bodies, as we state with respect to Knowing, Powerful, and Living, without any difference. As for the expression 'thing,' the Qur'ãn contains it, and proof makes it necessary.[133]

[133] *al-Fiṣal*, offset print, Dãru 'l-Maʻrifah, Beirut, 1395/1975, vol.2, pp.118-9.

He also says:

> Whoever states that Allãh is a body unlike bodies is not an anthropomorphist [read *mushabbih* in place of *mushtabih*] because it is the limit of the names of Allãh, since 'we name Him the Glorious and Exalted, which he did not assign to himself. As for he who says that Allãh is like bodies, he is an apostate regarding His names, and an anthropomorphist because of it.'[134]

Ibn Abi 'l-Ḥadīd ash-Shãfi‘ī al-Mu‘tazilī says:

> As for he who says He is a body unlike bodies, in the sense opposite to an accident from which it is impossible to imagine an action coming, and denies it has the sense of 'body', and when he then extends this expression to mean that He is a thing unlike things, and an essence unlike essences, then their case is easy, because they differ in expression, they being: ‘Alī ibn Manṣūr, as-Sakkãk, Yūnus ibn ‘Abdi 'r-Raḥmãn, and al-Faḍl ibn Shãdhãn, and all these are Shī‘ī elders . . . And partisans of Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam in our time claim that he did not believe in spiritual corporealism (*at-tajsīmu 'l-ma‘nawī*),[135] but that he believed that He is a body unlike bodies, with the meaning which we mentioned for Yūnus, as-Sakkãk, and the others, although al-Ḥasan ibn Mūsã an-Nawbakhtī, who was one of the eminent Shī‘ah, has had pure anthropomorphism attributed to him in the book *al-Ãrã' wa 'd-diyãnãt*.[136]

What an-Nawbakhtī mentions he relates from Mu‘tazilī adversaries of Hishãm, some of whom al-Murtaḍã names in his preceding discussion. Ibnu 'l-Jawzī spoke about him and his

[134] *Ibid.,* vol.2, p.120.

[135] Which necessarily implies corporeality, and is opposed to literal corporealism (*at-tajsīmu 'l-lafẓī*), i.e., the declaration that God has a body in the material sense.

[136] *Sharḥ Nahju 'l-balãghah*, vol.3, p.228.

book, saying: "Abū Muḥammad an-Nawbakhtī mentions, on the authority of al-Jāḥiẓ, on the authority of an-Naẓẓām . . ."[137] but Ibn Abi 'l-Ḥadīd leaves out the chain of transmission, for obvious reasons.

The Shaykh al-Mufīd states:

> Truly Allāh knows everything that is, prior to its existence, and there is no event which he does not know before its occurance . . . This is a doctrine of the entire Imāmiyyah, and we do not recognize that which the Mu‘tazilah relate from Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam with regard to a difference of opinion [i.e., the attribution to him which was mentioned previously, that he said God knows of events after their occurrence, the doctrine which Jahm held]. According to us this is a complete fabrication of theirs about him, and an error of those Shī‘ī who blindly follow them in it and state it on his authority. We find no listed book or established meeting [in which he explicitly clarifies his view concerning God's knowledge], and his statements on the fundamentals of the Imāmate and concommitant issues demonstrate the opposite of what the adversaries narrated from him.[138]

Thus it appears that the adversaries of the Imāmiyyah were more lenient about 'a body unlike bodies', and the Imāms, peace be upon them, stricter; I have already cited my opinion about the reason for this strictness.

22
THE OPPOSITION OF THE NON-IMĀMĪS TO HISHĀM'S OPINION

There is a body of evidence which offers convincing proof of

[137] *Talbīs Iblīs*, p.83.
[138] *Awāilu 'l-maqālāt fi 'l-madhāhib wa 'l-mukhtārāt*, Tabriz, 2nd printing, 1371, pp.21-22.

the innocence of Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam of that which his adversaries attributed to him regarding corporeality and anthropomorphism, and, moreover, that his statement 'a body unlike bodies' did not find favour with the Imãms.

1. Our scholars relate that Hishãm retracted his statement 'a body unlike bodies' after the Imãm aṣ-Ṣãdiq, peace be upon him, critisized him for it.[139]

2. A statement by Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam which al-Kulaynī transmits in the chapter on the falsity of the doctrine that God can be seen with ocular vision (*ibṭãlu 'r-ru'yah*), in the context of the *ḥadīth* of the Imãms, peace be upon them, which the distinguished al-Majlisī explains with his statement:

> Because he was one of the greatest followers of the *ma'ṣūmīn* (the infallible ones), peace be upon them, [the statement by Hishãm] was well regarded because it was taken from them.[140]

In this statement, Hishãm proves the impossibility of seeing God under any circumstance, as ocular sight is incapable of fixing upon anything besides bodies. He states at the end of it: 'Allãh is above comparison with anything'.[141] If Hisham was among those who believed in corporeality then it would not have been possible for him to say what he said.

3. His statement, which aṣ-Ṣadūq narrates on his authority, in reply to someone who asked: "In what manner do you know your Lord?" He stated: "I know Allãh, exalted be His greatness, through my soul, because it is the closest thing to me," and then gave proof through the compoundedness of his body and the principles according to which it was constructed. Then he said:

---

[139] al-Mufīd, *al-Fuṣūlu 'l-mukhtãrah*, vol.2, pp.284-5; al-Karãjikī, *Kanzu 'l-fawãid*, pp.198-9; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.3, p.290; vol.10, p.452; *Mir'ãtu 'l-'uqūl*, vol.2, p.5.

[140] *Mir'ãtu 'l-'uqūl*, vol.1, pp.341-2.

[141] *al-Kãfī,* "Kitãbu 't-Tawḥīd", vol.1, pp.99-100, no.269.

> It is impossible for there to be a composition for which there is no composer, and the stability of a form without a former; I know that [my body] has a creator who created it, and a former who formed it, different from it in all its aspects [i.e., not having that which is composed of parts, because they entail imperfection and need]. Allãh has said: *And in yourselves, can you not see?* (adh-Dhãriyãt, 51:21).[142]

4. We have already listed the names of those of Hishãm's books which deal with Unicity and the discussion related to it, such as the *Kitãbu 'd-Dalãlah ‘alã ḥadathi (ḥudūthi) 'l-ajsãm* – according to aṭ-Ṭūsī: *al-ashyã’* instead of *al-ajsãm*.[143] How could someone who describes Allãh as a body write a book in which he maintains that bodies are inherently created and incipient and not eternally pre-existent.

However, this book, like Hishãm's other books, and like the great mass of books by Imãmī scholars written during the first four centuries, has not come down to us; anyone who refers to the well known catalogues of Imãmī books – the catalogue of the Shaykhu 'ṭ-Ṭãifah aṭ-Ṭūsī and that of an-Najãshī – will find that ninety per cent of the familiar books whose names are listed in them have perished, and no trace of them remains except for their titles listed in the catalogues. I have described some of the reasons for this in my biography of the Shaykhu 'ṭ-Ṭãifah aṭ-Ṭūsī in the introduction to the "Kitãbu 't-Tawḥīd" from al-Kulaynī's *al-Kãfī*, referring to his famous library which the adversaries burned many times, just as they did others.

There remains before us no route to the study of Hishãm via

---

[142] *at-Tawḥīd*, p.289; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.3, pp.49-50.

[143] an-Najãshī, *al-Fihrist*, p.304; aṭ-Ṭūsī, *al-Fihrist*, p.204; Ibnu 'n-Nadīm, p.224; *Ma‘ãlimu 'l-‘ulamã’*; p.115; *Majma‘u 'r-rijãl*, vol.6, pp.232-3; *Īḍãḥu 'l-maknūn*, vol.1, p.476; *Hadiyyatu 'l-‘ãrifīn*, vol.2, p.507; *adh-Dharī‘ah*, vol.8, p.254.

the many different books he wrote, except to be guided by their titles to their contents, and from this tiny ray of light to be guided back to the doctrines, which the author expounded in them. From a study of Hishãm's books we are able to judge that he argued with atheists (*zanãdiqah*) and refuted them, argued with dualists, and attacked the materialism which existed in those days, and which was expressed by upholders of natural explanations (*tabãyi‘*). Despite all this we find some adversaries who accused him and his followers of atheism, and some who accused them of having taken their beliefs from dualists.

5. That which will follow is a biography of Hishãm ibn Sãlim, whom Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam opposed because the doctrines he espoused were based on *ḥadīth*s which were untrue or which he had not correctly understood. Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam charged him that these opinions only led him to believe in corporeality, which Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam refuted.

23
THE INCORRECTNESS OF ATTRIBUTING VIEWS ON CORPOREALITY AND ANTHROPOMORPHISM TO HISHÃM IBN SÃLIM

Here we shall consider Abū Muḥammad, Hishãm ibn Sãlim al-Jawãlīqī, al-Kūfī. His Imãmī biographers say of him:

> Hishãm ibn Sãlim was a client of Bishr ibn Marwãn from the capture of al-Jūzajãn,[144] conquered in the year 32/653 during the caliphate of ‘Uthmãn ibn ‘Affãn.[145] It is narrated of him on the authority of the two Imãms aṣ-Ṣãdiq and al-Kãẓim, peace be upon them, that he was trustworthy, veracious in belief, and so well-known for his

[144] The name of a region lying between Balkh, to the west of it, and Marw ar-Rūdh: see *Mu‘jamu 'l-buldãn*, vol.2, p.182; *ar-Rawḍu 'l-mi‘ṭãr*, p.182; *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, p.423.

[145] aṭ-Ṭabarī, vol.1, pp.2900-1; *Futūḥu 'l-buldãn*, vol.3, pp.503-4.

attachment to *wilãyah* that none can deny it.[146]

His patron, Bishr ibn Marwãn ibn al-Ḥakam al-Umawī (30/651–75/694) ruled Kūfah for his brother, the caliph ‘Abdu 'l-Malik, in the first year of his reign, 71/691, and then Baṣrah and Kūfah were brought under him in 12.74/4.694. His reign lasted only a few months, and he died at the beginning of 75/694.[147] It is inevitable that we pause, if briefly, on this portion of Hishãm's life, since it has a strong bearing on what we shall say about his opinions and the nature of the *ḥadīth*, which he relied on in the doctrines, he held.

It is apparent that the person who was captured on the day of the conquest of al-Jūzajãn was Abū Hishãm Sãlim and not Hishãm himself, since it is extremely unlikely that Hishãm's life – no matter what date we assign to the beginning of his life – could have stretched from 32/653, the year of the conquest of al-Jūzajãn, to after the death of the Imãm aṣ-Ṣãdiq, peace be upon him, in 148/765 – whatever we designate as the length of time he remained alive after him. In addition, Sãlim is an Arab name, which was commonly understood at that time as the name for a slave, and this naming would have been incorrect unless the captive on the day of the conquest of al-Jūzajãn had been the father of Hishãm who was then given an Arabic name.

Perhaps the attribution of clientage which the Shaykhu 'ṭ-Ṭãifah aṭ-Ṭūsī cites for Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam, 'al-Ju‘fī, their patron'[148] was what Hishãm inherited from his father Sãlim, because those who captured him were from the tribe of al-Ju‘fī,

---

[146] an-Najãshī, p.305; al-Kishshī, p.281; al-Barqī, pp.34-35; *Majma‘u 'r-rijãl*, vol.6, pp.234, 238; al-‘Allãmah, *Khulãṣatu 'l-aqwãl*, p.179; Abū Dãwūd, p.368; *Mu‘jam rijãli 'l-ḥadīth*, vol.19, pp.363-4.

[147] aṭ-Ṭabarī, vol.2, pp.816, 822, 834, 862; Ibnu 'l-Athīr, vol.4, pp.331, 347; *al-Ma‘ãrif*, pp.355, 458, 571; Khalīfah, *at-Tãrīkh*, vol.1, pp.341, 345, 349, 384, 385; *Tãrīkh Dimashq*, vol.10, pp.111-29; *Siyar a‘lãmi 'n-nubalã’*, vol.4, pp.145-6.

[148] *ar-Rijãl*, p.329, no.17.

the Qaḥṭãnī tribe of the Yemen. This does not contradict what Hishãm's biographers mention regarding his being a client of Bishr ibn Marwãn al-Umawī al-Qurashī al-‘Adnãnī. It suggests that Hishãm himself was a client of Bishr, because he had purchased him, and does not suggest anything more than that.

He broke his former clientage, which his father bequeathed to him, and perhaps this is the clue to the neglect by all of his biographers to mention his former, broken clientage, and their being satisfied to mention the subsequent one alone.

I do not know when Bishr purchased him, or how old he was on the day he was purchased, but it is safe to say that at that time Hishãm was young; rather it is probable that he had not even reached puberty when his patron Bishr died in 75/694. It is reliably stated that Hishãm was not an Imãmī when he was purchased, since it would have been odd for his previous patrons to have sold a Shī‘ī slave to Bishr ibn Marwãn, the Ummayad, who was far from being a Shī‘ī. It is even more unlikely that it be supposed that they were Shī‘ī and that Bishr followed them in faith. It is clear from this that he could not then have been a Shī‘ī, but that he held Ummayad beliefs after he became their client.

It is evident from his opinions, which I shall mention subsequently, that he was oriented towards the hearing of *ḥadīth*; it is also evident from these opinions, and due to the fact of his non-Imãmī upbringing, that he was oriented towards non-Imãmī *ḥadīth*. His views and thoughts were stamped by the *ḥadīth*, which he heard, to the point where it was difficult for him to rid himself of these opinions. It is also evident that Hishãm ibn Sãlim, after many years, perhaps when he had reached fifty years of age or more, chose the Imãmī school. This is confirmed by the fact that the first of the Imãms, peace be upon them, with whom he came into contact was the Imãm aṣ-Ṣãdiq, peace be upon him (83/702–148/765), although he was alive at the time

of as-Sajjãd (38/659–94/712) and during the period of al-Bãqir (57/676–114/733), peace be upon them, since if we establish Hishãm's age at the death of Bishr in 75/694 as being ten – and in my opinion this is the lowest estimate of his age – then Hishãm was fifty at the time of al-Bãqir's death. His abstention from contact with the Imãm of his time during this long period, and the delay of contact until the period of the Imãm aṣ-Ṣãdiq, peace be upon him, has no believable explanation other than that he did not believe in the Imãmate until aṣ-Ṣãdiq's time, at which time he joined him.

Hishãm's life was long, and he lived up to the time of the Imãm al-Kãẓim, peace be upon him (129/746–183/799).

24
A BRIEF BIOGRAPHY OF HISHÃM AL-JAWÃLĪQĪ

Hishãm ibn Sãlim is the second of the two Hishãms to whom they attributed the doctrine of pure corporealism and anthropomorphism; we shall review what has been cited in both Imãmī and non-Imãmī *ḥadīth*.

1. A Tradition from Muḥammad ibn Ḥakīm, who said:

> I described for Abu 'l-Ḥasan, peace be upon him, the belief of Hishãm al-Jawãlīqī, and what he says about the long-haired young man (*ash-shãbu 'l-muwaffar*) . . .[149]

A Tradition from Ibrãhīm ibn Muḥammad al-Khazzãz and Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn who said:

> We called upon Abu 'l-Ḥasan ar-Riḍã, peace be upon him, and we related to him that Muḥammad, may Allãh bless him and his family and [grant them salvation], saw his Lord in the form of a long-haired young man, of the age of boys of thirty years. We said: 'Hishãm ibn Sãlim and his

[149] *al-Kãfī*, vol.1, p.106, no.289; *at-Tawḥīd*, p.97; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.3, p.300.

> renowned companion aṭ-Ṭãq[150] and al-Maythamī[151] stated that He is hollow in the centre but the rest is firm.'[152]

A Tradition from Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Naṣr al-Bazanṭī from ar-Riḍã, peace be upon him. He said:

> He said to me: 'O Aḥmad! What is the difference between you and the followers of Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam with respect to Unicity?' I said: 'May I be made your ransom! We believe in the form because of the *ḥadīth* which narrates: "The Prophet of Allãh, may Allãh bless him and his family [and grant them salvation], saw his Lord in the form of a young man", and Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam believes in denying [that God has a] body.'[153]

This indicates that Hishãm denied the form, because its assertion would require that Allãh has a body.

2. al-Kishshī relates from ‘Abdu 'l-Malik ibn Hishãm al-Ḥannãṭ that he said to Abu 'l-Ḥasan ar-Riḍã, peace be upon him:

> May I be made your ransom! Hishãm ibn Sãlim claims that Allãh, the Great, the Exalted, is a form, and that Ãdam was created in the image of the Lord, and he describes this and that – and I indicated my flank and the hair on my head[154]– and Yūnus[155] a client of the Ãl Yaqṭīn and Hishãm ibn al-

---

[150] Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī an-Nu‘mãnī al-Bajalī, Mu’minu 'ṭ-Ṭãq, al-Kūfī (d. *c* 160/777) the trustworthy and famous theologian.

[151] ‘Alī ibn Ismã‘īl ibn Shu‘ayb ibn Maytham, Abu 'l-Ḥasan al-Maythamī.

[152] *al-Kãfī*, vol.1, pp.100-2, no.272; *at-Tawḥīd*, pp.113-4; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.4, pp.39-41.

[153] ‘Alī ibn Ibrãhīm, *at-Tafsīr*, vol.1, p.20; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.3, p.307; *Tafsīru 'l-burhãn*, vol.1, p.38; *Nūru 'th-thaqalayn*, vol.5, p.155.

[154] i.e., Hishãm ibn Sãlim believes that God has hair and limbs like a hand and a leg, and ‘Abdu 'l-Malik mentions this by way of allusion, dreading the direct expression of such things about God, especially in front of the Imãm, peace be upon him.

[155] Yūnus ibn ‘Abdi 'r-Raḥmãn, a student of Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam.

> Ḥakam claim that God is a thing unlike [other] things, that things are distinct from Him and He from things. They claim that the substantiation of a thing is a body, that He is a body unlike [other] bodies, a thing unlike things, substantiated and existent, not absent or non-existent, excepted from two restrictions: the restriction of invalidity,[156] and the restriction of anthropomorphism; and which of these two beliefs should I believe?

He, peace be upon him, said:

> [Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam] meant substantiation, and [Hishãm ibn Sãlim] compared his Lord with a created thing, may Allãh – Who has no likeness, no equal, no model, no parallel, and is not included in the attribute of created beings – be raised above this. Do not believe the like of what Hishãm ibn Sãlim believed; believe what was stated by the client of the clan of Yaqṭīn [Yūnus] and his companion [Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam].[157]

3. Hishãm ibn Sãlim al-Jawãlīqī and his followers used to say: "God is in human form, the uppermost part of Him is hollow, and the lowerest part is solid; He is a radiant light shining with a white light, He has five senses like humans, a hand, a leg, a nose, an ear, and a mouth, and He has abundant black hair which is a black light [since all of Him is light, and His body is white light, His abundant hair is black light], but he has no flesh nor blood,[158] and they affirm that he has every human limb

---

[156] *Ḥaddu 'l-ibṭãl*, i.e., the invalidity of the divine adjectives like Living, Powerful, Knowing, Hearing, and Seeing, signifying their meanings, because the affirmation of signification entails corporealism and anthropomorphism, and this judgement, i.e., that it is invalid, comes in many of the Imãmī *ḥadīth*, and this is what is meant by the agnosticism (*ta‘ṭīl*) of such as the Jahmiyyah.

[157] al-Kishshī, pp.284-5; *Majma‘u 'r-rijãl*, vol.6, p.237.

[158] *Maqãlãtu 'l-Islãmiyyīn*, vol.1, pp.105, 259; ash-Shahristãnī, vol.1, p.185; *al-Farq bayna 'l-firaq*, pp.51, 320-1; *al-Ansãb*, f. 590b; *al-Lubãb*, vol.3, p.389; *Minhãju 's-sunnah*, vol.1, pp.203, 259; and other sources.

except private parts and a beard",[159] and they deny, despite that, that He is a body,[160] and they relate that this was a view of Mu'minu ṭ-Ṭãq and 'Alī ibn Maytham.[161]

But ash-Shahristãnī and aṣ-Ṣafadī relate on the authority of Mu'minu 'ṭ-Ṭãq that he, stated: "Allãh is a light in the form of a divine human" and refuted that He was a body, but he said: "It has been related in a Tradition: 'Allãh created Ãdam in His image' and 'in the image of the Merciful', and the Tradition must be said to be true."[162] ash-Shahristãnī adds: "What is related on his authority with regard to anthropomorphism is without truth."[163]

Nevertheless, they relate that he believed in determinism and anthropomorphism, both he and his followers, the 'Shayṭã-niyyah',[164] and that 'truly Allãh is a limited and finite body.'[165]

They mention 'ash-Shayṭãniyyah' and 'al-Mushabbihah,' and say: "They are affiliated to Shayṭãnu 'ṭ-Ṭãq, and it is narrated from him that he believes in many of the anthropomorphic statements of the Rawãfiḍ [?],"[166]

From another stand-point, they cite in the biography of Mu'minu 'ṭ-Ṭãq: 'He was a Mu'tazilī',[167] and 'he shared the innovation of both the Mu'tazilah and the Rãfiḍah.'[168]

4. They add to these Yūnus ibn 'Abdi 'r-Raḥmãn al-Yaqṭīnī, al-Baghdãdī (*c* 125/742–208/823-4), the well-known Imãmī Traditionist and theologian, a student of Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam. They

---

[159] al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, vol.2, p.348-9.
[160] Ibn Abi 'l-Ḥadīd, vol.3, p.224.
[161] *Ibid.*, vol.3, p.224; *al-Ḥūru 'l-'īn*, p.149.
[162] *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal*, vol.1, p.187; *al-Wãfī bi 'l-wafayãt*, vol.4, p.104.
[163] *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal*, vol.1, p.186.
[164] *al-Bad' wa 't-tãrīkh*, vol.5, p.132.
[165] *Ibid.*, vol.1, p.85.
[166] *al-Ansãb*, vol.8, pp.238-9; *al-Lubãb*, vol.2, p.225.
[167] *al-Wãfī bi 'l-wafayãt*, vol.4, p.104.
[168] a1-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, vol.2, pp.348, 353.

say about him: 'He was one of the Shī'ī anthropomorph-ists',[169] and: 'Yūnus went too far in the matter of anthropomorphism',[170] 'and he claimed that the angels who bear the throne also carry the Creator',[171] 'and he concludes that He is predicated by His words: *and eight will hold the throne of your Lord above them on that day* [al-Ḥãqqah 69:17]',[172] 'since it has been narrated in the Tradition: the angels are sometimes weighed down from the pressure of the greatness of Allãh on the throne.'[173]

25
VIEWS ON CORPOREALITY AND ANTHROPOMORPHISM ATTRIBUTED TO AL-JAWÃLĪQĪ

It is clear that these views, whether correctly attributed or not, are reactions to the following *ḥadīth* which these people heard, which they believed to be correct, which they understood in their ostensive meaning. These are the *ḥadīth*, which are indicated in the doctrines themselves.

1. A Tradition from Ummu 'ṭ-Ṭufayl, the wife of Ubayy ibn Ka'b, the well known companion of the prophet, who said:

> I heard the Messenger of Allãh, may Allãh bless him [and his family] and grant him [them] salvation, mention that he saw his Lord in a dream in the form of a long-haired young man (*shãb muwaffar*), in green, on a carpet of gold, and that on his feet there were two golden slippers.

---

[169] *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal*, vol.1, p.188; *al-Khiṭaṭ*, vol.2, p.353.

[170] *al-Farq bayna 'l-firaq*, p.53; *al-Ansãb*, f. 603b; *al-Lubãb*, vol.3, p.421.

[171] *Maqãlãtu 'l-Islãmiyyīn*, vol.1, p.106; *Minhãju 's-sunnah*, vol.1, p.207; *al-Farq*, p.216; *at-Tabṣīr fi 'd-dīn*, p.43.

[172] *al-Farq*, p.53; *al-Ansãb*, f. 603b; *al-Lubãb*, vol.3, p.421.

[173] *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal*, vol.l, p.188.

By *muwaffar* he means 'having *wafrah*',[174] and by 'green' he means 'in green clothing'.[175]

It is stated in the biography of Abu 'l-Ḥasan, ʻAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn Bashshãr al-Baghdãdī, al-Ḥanbalī (d. 313/ 925), the ascetic Traditionist, who they say had the power of miracles and that whoever loved him was a follower of the *sunnah*, and whose tomb, many centuries after his death, was apparently famous in Baghdad and visited by the people:[176]

> Aḥmad al-Barmakī said: 'I asked Abu 'l-Ḥasan ibn Bashshãr about the *ḥadīth* of Ummu 'ṭ-Ṭufayl and the *ḥadīth* of Ibn ʻAbbãs [to follow] concerning ocular vision [of God], and he said: "Both of them are correct." A man then objected, and said: "These *ḥadīth*s should not be cited at a time like this!" Then Ibn Bashshãr said: "Islam is being extinguished".'[177]

The *ḥadīth* of Ibn ʻAbbãs, who stated:

> The Messenger of Allãh, may Allãh bless him [and his family] and grant him [them] salvation, said: 'I saw my Lord in the form of a young man with long hair.'[178]

---

[174] *Wafrah*: the hair massed on the head, especially that which falls onto the ears: *al-Qãmūs*, vol.2, p.155; *Tãju 'l-ʻarūs*, vol.3, p.605; *Lisãnu 'l-ʻArab*, vol.5, pp.288-9; *al-Muʻjamu 'l-waṣīṭ*, vol.2, p.1046.

[175] al-Bayhaqī, *al-Asmã' wa 'ṣ-ṣifãt*, pp.446-7; *Tãrīkh Baghdãd*, vol.13, p.311; *Usdu 'l-ghãbah*, vol.7, p.356; and many other sources. For adh-Dhahabī's opinion on the *ḥadīth* see: *Siyar aʻlãmi 'n-nubalã'*, vol.10, pp.602-4; as-Suyūṭī defended its veracity (*al-La'ãlī al-maṣnūʻah*, vol.1, pp.28-29.

[176] *Tãrīkh Baghdãd*, vol.12, pp.66-67; *al-Muntaẓam*, vol.6, pp.198-9; *Shadharãtu 'dh-dhahab*, vol.2, p.267; *Ṭabaqãtu 'l-Ḥanãbilah*, vol.2, pp.57-63; *al-Minhaju 'l-Aḥmad*, vol.2, pp.7-11.

[177] *Ṭabaqãtu 'l-Ḥanãbilah*, vol.2, p.59; *al-Minhaju 'l-Aḥmad*, vol.2, p.8.

[178] aṭ-Ṭabarãnī narrates it in *as-Sunnah* from Abū Zurʻah ar-Rãzī, ʻUbaydullãh ibn ʻAbdi 'l-Karīm (200/815–264/878), one of the *imãm*s of *ḥadīth*, who stated: "It is a correct *ḥadīth*, which only the Muʻtazilah deny"; *Kanzu 'l-ʻummãl*, vol.1, p.204; *Muntakhab* [Gloss to Ibn Ḥanbal's *Musnad*] vol.1, p.113; *al-La'ãlī al-maṣnūʻah*, vol.1, pp.29-30).

The *ḥadīth* of Mu'ãdh ibn 'Afrã':

> The Messenger of Allãh, may Allãh bless him [and his family] and grant him [them] salvation, related that he saw the Lord of the Worlds, the Exalted, the Glorious, in Paradise, wearing a crown which dazzled the vision.[179]

The *ḥadīth* of Ibn 'Abbãs from the Messenger of Allãh, may Allãh bless him [and his family] and grant him [them] salvation, who said:

> I saw my Lord in the form of a beardless young man, on whom there was a red garment.[180]

And another *ḥadīth* from him, may Allãh bless him [and his family] and grant him [them] salvation, in which he said:

> I saw my Lord, the Exalted, the Glorious, a young man, beardless, with short, curly hair, on whom there was a red garment.[181]

And many other *ḥadīth*s.

2. As for the Prophet's seeing his Lord during his night journey to Paradise (*al-isrã'*), there is nothing more than that which is related by the non-Imãmī sects about it:

> Ibn 'Abbãs said, and he swore by this: '[The Prophet] saw his Lord with his eyes twice.'[182]
>
> al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī used to swear by Allãh: 'Indeed

[179] *Kanzu 'l-'ummãl*, vol.1, p.204; *Muntakhab*, vol.l, p.113; *al-La'ãlī al-maṣnū'ah*, vol.1, p.30; from aṭ-Ṭabarãnī in *as-Sunnah*, and al-Baghawī took it from him, as in *al-Iṣãbah*, vol.6, p.140.

[180] *Tãrīkh Baghdãd*, vol.11, p.214; *al-La'ãlī al-maṣnū'ah*, vol.1, p.30.

[181] *Ṭabaqãtu 'l-Ḥanãbilah*, vol.2, pp.45-46, where its veracity is defended.

[182] at-Tirmidhī, vol.5, p.395; *al-Mustadrak 'ala 'ṣ-Ṣaḥīḥayn*, vol.1, p.65; *at-Tawḥīd wa ithbãt ṣifãti 'r-rabb*, pp.200, 205; Ibn Kathīr, *at-Tafsīr*, vol.3, p.304; vol.7, p.424; *Fatḥu 'l-bãrī*, vol.10, p.230; *ad-Durru 'l-manthūr*, vol.6, p.124; *Fatḥu 'l-qadīr*, vol.5, p.110; and many other sources.

> Muḥammad saw his Lord.'[183]
>
> ʻIkrimah used to say: 'Yes, he saw Him, then he saw Him, and then he saw Him', until his life ended.[184]

And an-Nawawī said: "A group of commentators hold the view that he saw Him with his eyes; it is the belief of Anas, ʻIkrimah, al-Ḥasan, and ar-Rabīʻ. . ."[185]

Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal was asked about this, and he said: 'I shall say, with the *ḥadīth* of Ibn ʻAbbãs: "With his eyes he saw his Lord, he saw Him, he saw Him", until the life of Aḥmad comes to an end.'[186]

an-Nawawī said:

> What is quoted by most of the scholars is: 'Truly the Messenger of Allãh, may Allãh bless him [and his family] and grant him [them] salvation, saw his Lord with the two eyes of his head on the night of al-Isrã' . . . He, the Exalted, the Glorious in stature, will be visible on the Day of Reckoning to the whole of creation: men and *jinn*, male and female, believer or unbeliever, and the angels, Gabriel and others.'[187]

As for the greater part of the *ḥadīth* themselves, I shall only mention one of them, which was narrated by Muḥammad ibn Isḥãq, the renowned Traditionist and biographer, with its chain

---

183 *at-Tawḥīd*, pp.199-200; an-Nawawī, *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, vol.3, p.5; *Fatḥu 'l-bãrī*, vol.10, p.231; *ʻUmdatu 'l-qãrī*, vol.19, p.198; etc.

184 aṭ-Ṭabarī, *at-Tafsīr*, vol.27, p.28; *ash-Sharīʻah*, p.496; Ibn Kathīr, *at-Tafsīr*, vol.7, p.425; *ad-Durru 'l-manthūr*, vol.6, p.124.

185 *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, vol.3, p.6; *al-Mirqãt sharḥu 'l-mishkãt*, vol.5, p.306.

186 *ash-Shifã*, vol.1, p.260; al-Khafãjī, *Sharḥu 'sh-Shifã*, vol.2, p.292; al-Qãrī, *Sharḥu 'sh-Shifã*, vol.1, p.422; *ar-Rawḍu 'l-unuf*, vol.3, p.445; *Sharḥu 'l-mawãhibi 'l-laddunniyyah*, vol.6, p.120.

187 *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, vol.3, p.5; *al-Mirqãt*, vol.5, p.308; *as-Sīrah al-Ḥalabiyyah*, vol.1, p.410; refer in particular to al-Qãḍī ʻAyyãḍ, *ash-Shifã*, vol.1, pp.257-60; al-Khafãjī, *Sharḥu 'sh-Shifã*, vol.2, pp.285-92; al-Qãrī, *Sharḥu 'sh-Shifã*, vol.1, pp.416-23.

of authority from 'Abdullãh ibn Abī Salamah, who said:

> 'Abdullãh ibn 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭãb queried 'Abdullãh ibn 'Abbãs, asking him: 'Did Muḥammad, may Allãh bless him [and his family] and grant him [them] salvation, see his Lord?' Ibn 'Abbãs replied to him: 'Yes.' 'Abdullãh ibn 'Umar retorted: 'Then how did he see Him?' And he answered: 'Truly, he saw Him.' – Yūnus [one of the narrators from Ibn Ishaq] elaborated in his narration: ' . . . in the form of an adolescent, in a green meadow, beneath Him a carpet of gold, on a golden chair, held by four angels: one in the form of a man, one in the form of a bull, one in the form of an eagle, and one in the form of a lion.'[188]

26
THE OPINIONS OF HISHÃM AL-JAWÃLĪQĪ TAKEN FROM NON-IMÃMĪ *ḤADĪTH*

3. As for what has been said in which mention is made of limbs and extremities (which are either figurative, like that which is narrated in the Holy Qur'ãn and many *ḥadīth* of the *sunnah*, which are given a literal sensory meaning either through inattention or inadvertance, or that which is ostensively literal and only permits interpretation with difficulty, of which there are also many in the *sunnah*) there are many examples, some of which have been previously indicated in the examples we cited from the doctrines of non-Imãmī Traditionists. In what has been reported which we have not cited is the statement of the

---

[188] *al-Asmã' wa 'ṣ-ṣifãt*, p.443; *at-Tawḥīd wa ithbãt ṣifãti 'r-rabb*, p.198; *ash-Sharī'ah*, pp.494-5; *ash-Shifã*, vol.1, p.258; al-Khafãjī, *Sharḥu 'sh-Shifã*, vol.2, p.287; al-Qãrī, *Sharḥu sh-Shifã*, vol.1, p.418; *ad-Durru 'l-manthūr*, vol.6, p.124; etc.

Prophet, may Allãh bless him and his family and grant them salvation, about what they would see of Him:

> [On the Day of Judgement] our Lord shall reveal His leg, and all male and female believers shall fall prostrate before it.[189]

And that which has been related in numerous *ḥadīth* with various wordings:

> It is said *unto Hell: 'Are you full?' And it replies. 'Are there any more?'* [Qãf, 50:30], and it is not full until the Lord/Lord of the Worlds/the Merciful puts His foot into it and compresses some of it against the rest (*yuzwī ba‘ḍa-hã ilã ba‘ḍ*, and there is a variant reading: *yuzwã ba‘da-hã ilã ba‘ḍ*) and it says: 'Enough (*qaṭi, qaṭi, qaṭi/qadi, qadi, qadi/qadī, qadī, qadī/qadnī, qadnī, qadnī*)! Your Power!'[190]

4. The *ḥadīth* of Abū Hurayrah:

> Allãh created Adam in His image, His height being sixty cubits.[191]

The *ḥadīth* of ‘Abdullãh ibn ‘Umar:

> Do not distort the meaning, for truly the son of Adam was created in the image of the Merciful.[192]

And the *ḥadīth* concerning the Day of Judgement (*al-qiyãmah*):

> Allãh will come to them [the believers on the Day of Judgement] in His form, which they know [after He has

---

[189] al-Bukhãrī, vol.6, p.198; vol.9, p.159; ad-Dãrimī, *as-Sunan*, vol.2, pp.326-7.

[190] al-Bukhãrī, vol.6, p.173; vol.8, p.168; vol.9, pp.143, 164; Muslim, vol.8, pp.151-2; at-Tirmidhī, vol.4, pp.691-2; vol.5, p.390; Aḥmad, vol.2, pp.276, 314, 369, 507; vol.3, pp.13, 78, 134, 141, 234; ad-Dãrimī, vol.2, pp.340-1; aṭ-Ṭabarī, *at-Tafsīr*, Būlãq ed., vol.26, pp.105-7; etc.

[191] al-Bukhãrī, vol.8, p.62; Muslim, vol.8, p.149; Aḥmad, vol.2, pp.315, 323; *at-Tawḥīd wa ithbãt ṣifãti 'r-rabb*, pp.39-41; *ash-Sharī‘ah*, p.314.

[192] *at-Tawḥīd*, p.38; *ash-Sharī‘ah*, p.315; see the defence of the soundness of this *ḥadīth* by Ibn Rãhwayh, Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, and adh-Dhahabī, *Mīzãnu 'l-i‘tidãl*, vol.2, pp.419-20.

> come to them in a form which they did not recognize, and they rejected Him], and He will say: 'I am your Lord!' And they will say: 'You are our Lord.'[193]

5. Regarding place, the most curious thing said about it is what was said about 'the Throne (*al-'Arsh*)' and 'the Chair (*al-Kursī*)' in His words: *His chair encompasses the heavens and the earth* [al-Baqarah, 2:255] in the statement of Ibn 'Abbãs:

> The chair/His chair is the place of His foot/two feet, and the throne – only Allãh decrees its destiny.[194]

There is a *ḥadīth* with the same meaning related by 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭãb, Abū Mūsã al-Ash'arī, Abū Dharr, and Ibn Mas'ūd.[195]

Concerning the sitting of Allãh above the throne:

> Truly Allãh is above His throne; and truly it gives the sound of a newly loaded saddle, as the one who rides it weighs it down.[196]
>
> And He sits upon it, and only a distance of four fingers breadth remains.[197]
>
> Allãh has prepared and set aside this excess space of four

---

[193] al-Bukhãrī, vol.9, p.156; Muslim, vol.1, p.113.

[194] *al-Mustadrak 'ala 'ṣ-Ṣaḥīḥayn*, vol.2, p.282; al-Ḥãkim and adh-Dhahabī authenticated it, *at-Tawḥīd wa ithbãt ṣifãti 'r-rabb*, pp.107, 108; *Tãrīkh Baghdãd*, vol.9, pp.251-2; *al-Asmã' wa 'ṣ-ṣifãt*, p.354; Ibn Kathīr, *at-Tafsīr*, vol.1, p.457; *ad-Durru 'l-manthūr*, vol.1, p.327; *Fatḥu 'l-qadīr*, vol.l, p.273; *Rūḥu 'l-ma'ãnī,* vol.3, p.10, vol.16, p.154.

[195] aṭ-Ṭabarī, *at-Tafsīr*, Būlãq ed., vol.3, p.7; *al-Asmã' wa 'ṣ-ṣifãt*, pp.353-4; ad-Dãrimī, *as-Sunan*, vol.2, p.325; *al-Mustadrak 'ala 'ṣ-Ṣaḥīḥayn*, vol.2, pp.364-5; *ad-Durru 'l-manthūr*, vol.3, p.298; *Ṭabaqãtu 'l-Ḥanãbilah*, vol.1, p.134. Many of the ancient commentators also explain it in this way; see aṭ-Ṭabarī, *at-Tafsīr*, vol.3, p.7.

[196] Abū Dãwūd, *as-Sunan*, vol.4, p.232; *at-Tawḥīd wa ithbãt ṣifãti 'r-rabb*, pp.103-4; *ash-Sharī'ah*, p.293; aṭ-Ṭabarī, *at-Tafsīr*, vol.3, p.8; *al-Asmã' wa 'ṣ-ṣifãt*, pp.417-9.

[197] ad-Dãrimī, refutation of Bishr al-Marīsī, '*Aqãidu 's-salaf*, p.432; aṭ-Ṭabarī, *at-Tafsīr*, vol.3, p.8; *'Awnu 'l-ma'būd*, vol.13, pp.32-33.

> fingers breadth for Muḥammad, may Allãh bless him and his family and grant them salvation, in order that he may sit upon it on the Day of Judgement;[198] that is the explanation of His statement: *It may be that your Lord will raise you to a praised position* [al-Isrã’, 17:79].[199]

aṭ-Ṭabarī gave a blistering defense of the soundness of this explanation and of the sitting of Allãh,[200] and al-Qurṭubī said: "aṭ-Ṭabarī stood up for its admissibility with a plethora of words."[201]

Abū Bakr an-Naqqãsh narrated from Abū Dãwūd as-Sijistãnī, Sulaymãn ibn al-Ash‘ath (202/817–275/889), the famous author of the *Sunan*, that he said: "Whoever denies this *ḥadīth* [the *ḥadīth* about the sitting of Allãh] stands accused [of apostasy and being outside the religion] by us; knowledgeable people shall continue to believe in it."[202]

Ibnu 'l-Qayyim al-Jawziyyah, the well-known student of Ibn Taymiyyah, related from the Qãḍī Abū Ya‘lã al-Ḥanbalī that he stated:

> al-Marwazī composed a book on the virtue of the Prophet, may Allãh bless him [and his family] and grant him [them] salvation, in which he mentions his being seated on the throne.

The Qãḍī mentions that it is a belief [of a group of twenty-seven, whose names he cites], and Ibnu 'l-Qayyim adds:

---

198 *Tãrīkh Baghdãd*, vol.8, p.52; *Ṭabaqãtu 'l-Ḥanãbilah*, vol.2, p.67.

199 ad-Dãrimī, vol.2, p.233; *ash-Shifã*, vol.1, p.291; Ibnu 'l-Jawzī, *Zãdu 'l-masīr*, vol.5, p.76; *ad-Durru 'l-manthūr*, vol.l, p.328; vo1.4, p.198; *Sharḥu 'l-Mawãhibi 'l-laddunniyyah*, vol.8, pp.367-8.

200 *at-Tafsīr*, Būlãq ed., vol.15, pp.99-100.

201 *Aḥkãmu 'l-Qur'ãn*, vol.10, p.311.

202 al-Qurṭubī, *Aḥkãmu 'l-Qur'ãn*, vol.10, p.311; Abū Ḥayyãn, *al-Baḥru 'l-muḥīṭ*, vol.6, p.72; al-Qasṭalãnī, *al-Mawãhibu 'l-laddunniyyah*, vol.2, p.411; az-Zurqãnī, *Sharḥu 'l-Mawãhib*, vol.8, p.368; ash-Shawkãnī, *Fatḥu 'l-qadīr*, vol.3, p.252; al-Ãlūsī, *Ruḥu 'l-ma‘ãnī*, vol.15, p.142.

> It is a belief of Ibn Jarīr aṭ-Ṭabarī, and of al-Mujãhid [ibn Jabr] the *imãm* of all of them in *tafsīr*; and it is a belief of Abu 'l-Ḥasan ad-Dãr Quṭnī [too] . . .[203]

al-Marwazī is Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥajjãj, Abū Bakr al-Marwazī (al-Marwarūdhī) al-Baghdãdī (*c* 200/816275/888), one of the greatest followers of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, and the foremost among them for his piety and merit. Aḥmad was on intimate terms with him, and was at ease in his company; it was he who took charge of Aḥmad's body after he died and washed it. He narrated many matters on his authority, and substantiated authentic *ḥadīth* on his authority, as is stated in his biography.[204]

Because of this belief, and al-Marwazī's book about it, a bloody public disturbance took place in Baghdad, as Ibnu 'l-Athīr and others mention concerning the events of the year 317/929:

> A great public altercation took place in Baghdad during this year between the followers of Abū Bakr al-Marwazī al-Ḥanbalī and others from among the general populace, and many soldiers became involved in it. The cause of it was that the followers of al-Marwazī said, in a commentary on His words: *It may be that your Lord will raise you to a praised position,* that Allãh will seat the Prophet, may Allãh bless him [and his family] and grant him [them] salvation, with Him on the throne, while the other side said: 'On the contrary, it is mediation (*shafã‘ah*).'[205] A public

---

[203] Ibnu 'l-Qayyim, *Badãi‘u 'l-fawãid*, vol.4, pp.39-40.

[204] *Tãrīkh Baghdãd*, vol.4, pp.424-5; *al-Muntaẓam*, vol.5, pt.2, pp.94-95; *Ṭabaqãtu 'l-Ḥanãbilah*, vol.1, pp.56-63; *al-Minhaju 'l-Aḥmad*, vol.1, pp. 172-4; *al-‘Ibar*, vol.2, p.54; Ibn Kathīr, vol.11, p.54; *Shadharãtu 'dh-dhahab*, vol.2, p.166; Ibnu 'l-Athīr, vol.7, p.435.

[205] This is the explanation, which is agreed upon between the Shī‘ah and many Sunnī scholars.

altercation ensued, and the parties did battle with each other, and there were many casualties among them.[206]

6. I have found no reasonable explanation for what has been attributed to al-Jawãlīqī regarding his statement: 'Truly He is hollow at the centre, and the rest is *ṣamad*', except that he glossed *ṣamad* as 'solid', an interpretation that will be discussed subsequently, and that he found something which proved that Allãh's having limbs and extremities was contradictory with His being solid from head to foot. He went on to establish that He, praise be to Him, had every limb except pudendum and beard', and was compelled to divide Him into two parts: the higher one being hollow, and the lower one eternally solid, with no pudendum.

27
WHAT IS RELATED FROM THE TWO HISHÃMS IS ALSO RELATED FROM NON-IMÃMĪS

It is appropriate to mention that what is attributed to Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam and Hishãm al-Jawãlīqī, is attributed to others who pre-dated both of them or were their contemporaries.

1. Abu 'l-Ḥasan Muqãtil ibn Sulaymãn al-Azdī, al-Balkhī, al-Marwazī (*c* 70/689–150/767), who both heard and reported a great deal, and was particularly dedicated to commentary. He travelled throughout the Islamic lands (Marw, then Iraq, the Ḥijãz, Damascus) reporting and commenting on *ḥadīth* in Mecca, Baghdad and Beirut, and finally settled in Baṣrah, where he died. He became so famous for his commentary on the Holy Qur’ãn that ash-Shãfi‘ī said of him: "People are entirely dependent on Muqãtil for commentary." He was one of those

[206] Ibnu 'l-Athīr, vol.8, p.213; Ibn Kathīr, vol.11, p.162; Abu 'l-Fidã’, vol.2, pp.74-75; Ibnu 'l-Wardī, vol.1, p.390; *Tãrīkhu 'l-khulafã’*, p.384.

who was given as an example of those who believed in pure corporealism and anthropomorphism, and of falseness in *ḥadīth*. He was an adversary of his compatriot, Jahm ibn Ṣafwān, religiously and politically. Ibn Ḥibbān stated:

> He took from Jews and Christians knowledge of the Qur'ān, which corresponded with their Books, and he was an anthropomorphist, comparing the Lord with created beings.[207]

He and his followers stated:

> Allāh is a body, and has *jummah*[208] and is in human form, flesh and blood, hair and bone, having extremities and limbs, hands, legs, a head, eyes, and is solid; yet despite all this He does not resemble anything else, and nothing else resembles Him.[209]

al-Maqdīsī and Nashwān al-Ḥimyarī added: "He is seven spans of His own span."[210] By 'followers of al-Muqātil' is meant all those followers of *ḥadīth* who were influenced by him and who held beliefs similar to his. Among these were:

a) His confederate (*rabīb*) Nūḥ ibn Abī Maryam (Yazīd), Abū 'Iṣmah al-Marwazī, al-Ḥanafī, the *qāḍī* of Marw (*c* 100/719–173/789), who heard and narrated a great amount, and studied jurisprudence with Abū Ḥanīfah; at-Tirmidhī and Ibn Mājah excerpted his *ḥadīth* concerning *tafsīr*. Muqātil married his mother and reared him, and Abū 'Iṣmah learned his ideas from him; they say about him what they say about his *shaykh* Muqātil.[211]

---

[207] Ibn Ḥibbān, *Kitābu 'l-Majrūḥīn (aḍ-Ḍu'afā')*, vol.3, pp.14-16; *Tārīkh Baghdād*, vol.13, pp.160-9; *Mīzānu 'l-i'tidāl*, vol.4, pp.172-5; *Tahdhību 't-tahdhīb*, vol.10, pp.279-85; and many sources.

[208] = *wafrah*, see above note no.174 (*al-Mu'jamu 'l-wasīṭ*, vol.1, p.137).

[209] *Maqālātu 'l-Islāmiyyīn*, vol.l, pp.213, 214, 258-9; *al-Fiṣal*, vol.4, p.205; *al-Bad' wa 't-tārīkh*, vol. 5, p. 141; Ibn Abi 'l-Ḥadīd, vol.3, p.224.

[210] *al-Bad' wa 't-tārfkh*, vol.1, p.85; vol.5, p.141; *al-Ḥūru 'l-'iyn*, p.149.

[211] Ibn Ḥibbān, *aḍ-Ḍu'afā'*, vol.3, pp.48-49; *Mīzānu 'l-i'tidāl*, vol.4, pp.279-80; *Tahdhību 't-tahdhīb*, vol.10, pp.486-9; etc.

b) Abū ‘Abdillāh, Nu‘aym ibn Ḥammād ibn Mu‘āwiyah al-A‘war al-Khuzā‘ī, al-Marwazī, then al-Miṣrī (*c* 148/765–228/843), a distinguished Traditionist, was an *imām* of the *sunnah*. al-Bukhārī, Abū Dāwūd, at-Tirmidhī, and Ibn Mājah excerpted his *ḥadīth*; Muslim did the same in the preface to his *Ṣaḥīḥ*. He was brought from Egypt to Iraq during the caliphate of the ‘Abbāsid al-Mu‘taṣim due to his denial of the doctrine of the createdness of the Qur’ān. He was imprisoned there until he died, and was buried in his chains, unshrouded, and without prayers being said for him.

He was a scribe for Abū ‘Iṣmah, who raised and educated him, and he composed many books refuting the Jahmiyyah. They said about him what they said about his *shaykh*, although the only ones who explicitly denied him were ad-Dūlābī and al-Azdī because they considered him one of the martyrs of their Miḥnah, or Inquisition.[212]

2. Abū Muthannah, Mu‘ādh ibn Mu‘ādh al-‘Anbarī, al-Baṣrī, *qāḍī* of Baṣrah (119/737–196/812), one of the distinguished Traditionists whose reliability and explication of *ḥadīth* they trusted, among them the followers of the *sunnah* books and others.[213]

One narrator said:

> I questioned Mu‘ādh al-‘Anbarī, saying: 'Does He have a face?' And he replied: 'Yes.' So I brought up all the limbs, nose, mouth, chest, belly, but left off mentioning the genitals, gesturing towards my own with my hands, and

---

[212] *Tārīkh Baghdād*, vol.13, pp.306-14; *Mīzānu 'l-i‘tidāl*, vol.4, pp.267-70; *Tahdhību 't-tahdhīb*, vol.10, pp.458-63; etc. Refer to the text stating that they followed Muqātil in anthropomorphism and corporealism, they and Dāwūd al-Jawāribī (to follow): *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal*, vol.1, p.187; *Talbīs iblis*, p.86; Ibn Abi 'l-Ḥadīd, vol.3, p.224. See also Watt, W. M., *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought,* p. 178.

[213] *Tahdhību 't-tahdhīb*, vol.10, pp.194-5; *Taqrību 't-tahdhīb*, vol.2, p.275; *Tārīkh Baghdād*, vol.13, pp.131-4.

questioning. He said: 'Yes.' So I asked: 'Male or female?' And he replied: 'Male!'[214]

One feast day, a man paid a call on Muʿãdh ibn Muʿãdh, the *qãḍī* of Baṣrah. He was holding some meat cooked in vinegar in his hands and the visitor asked him all there was to ask about the Creator. He said: 'He, by Allãh, is like that which is between my hands, flesh and blood!'[215]

3. Dãwūd al-Jawãribī. Nothing is mentioned about him, not even the name of his father, except for what is related on the authority of Yazīd ibn Hãrūn al-Wãṣiṭī (118/736–206/821), one of the distinguished Traditionists, there is consensus about, that he said: "al-Jawãribī and al-Marrīsī [Bishr ibn Ghiyãth] are unbelievers." He said that Dãwūd al-Jawãribī was crossing Wãsiṭ bridge and the bridge broke, and all who were on it drowned [except Dãwūd, who survived]. Yazīd used to say: "He who expelled a devil, and he said: 'I am Dãwūd al-Jawãribī.'"'[216] From this it is apparent that he was an ʿIrãqī, and that he and Bishr were contemporaries.

al-Ashʿarī counts Dãwūd and his followers among the Murjiah, and ash-Shahristãnī counts him and Nuʿaym ibn Ḥammãd among the anthropomorphists of the Ḥashwiyyah followers of *ḥadīth* who were in agreement with Muqãtil ibn Sulaymãn. ʿAbdu 'l-Qãhir al-Baghdãdī, Abū 'l-Muẓaffar al-Isfarãyīnī and others concluded the same, counting him among 'the anthropomorphists,' and not 'the Rãfiḍah' or 'the Rãfiḍī anthropomorphists.'

It is related from him that he said that what he worshipped is a body, flesh and blood, having extremities and limbs, with hands, feet, a head, a tongue, eyes, and ears; despite that, it is a body unlike bodies, a flesh unlike other flesh, blood unlike

---

[214] Ibn Abi 'l-Ḥadīd, vol.3, pp.224-5.

[215] Ibnu 'l-Murtaḍã, *al-Munyah wa 'l-amal*, p.116; Ibn Abi 'l-Ḥadīd, vol.3, p.225.

[216] *Mīzãnu 'l-iʿtidãl*, vol.2, p.23; *Lisãnu 'l-mīzãn*, vol.2, p.427.

blood, and so on for the rest of the attributes, that He does not resemble any created thing, and nothing resembles Him; that He is hollow from His highest point to His chest, and solid elsewhere, and He has an abundance of short, black hair. Dãwūd al-Jawãribī said: "I was excused from [mentioning] the private parts and the beard, and I was questioned about what the evidence for this was. What substantiates it is in the Traditions."[217] But Ibn Ḥazm numbered him among the Shī‘ah[218] and said:

> Dãwūd al-Jawãribī[219] was one of their greatest theologians, who claimed that his Lord is flesh and blood, in the manner of human beings.[220]

as-Sam‘ãnī said:

> From [Hishãm al-Jawãlīqī] Dãwūd al-Jawãribī took his statement that his God has all the limbs, except private parts and beard.[221]

adh-Dhahabī said, and Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalãnī confirms it as being his word:

> Dãwūd al-Jawãribī, head of the ar-Rãfiḍah and corporealism, one to be flung into Hell.[222]

The Imãmī sources do not mention a thing about him, and moreover, his name does not appear in any one of them, old or new.

---

217 *Maqãlãtu 'l-Islãmiyyīn*, vol.1, pp.214, 258-9; *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal*, vol.1, pp.105, 187; *al-Bad' wa 't-tãrīkh*, vol.5, p.140; *al-Farq bayna 'l-firaq*, pp.216, 320; *Uṣūlu 'd-dīn*, pp.74, 337; *at-Tabṣīr fi 'd-dīn*, p.107; *Talbīs iblīs*, pp.86, 87).

218 *al-Fiṣal*, vol.2, p.112; vol.4, p.93.

219 In the manuscript: al-Jawãzī, and in *al-Lisãn*: al-Jawãrī.

220 *al-Fiṣal*, vol.4, p.182; *Siyar a‘lãmi 'n-nubalã'*, vol.10, p.544; *Lisãnu 'l-mīzãn*, vol.2, p.427.

221 *al-Ansãb*, f. 590b; *al-Lubãb*, vol.3, p.389.

222 *Mīzãnu 'l-i‘tidãl*, vol.2, p.23; *Lisãnu 'l-mīzãn*, vol.2, p.427.

28
HISHÃM IBN AL-ḤAKAM AND HIS 'REFUTATION OF HISHÃM AL-JAWÃLĪQĪ' AND THE 'REFUTATION OF MU’MINU 'Ṭ-ṬÃQ' THAT IS ATTRIBUTED TO HIM

Opposition to al-Jawãlīqī for what he stated was not confined to the Imãms, peace be upon them. Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam and his followers opposed al-Jawãlīqī, as is stated in what ‘Alī ibn Ibrãhīm, with a sound chain of transmission, narrated from Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Naṣr al-Bazanṭī – the *ḥadīth* has been cited previously – and by Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam.[223]

The biographers of Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam mention in a list of his books a *Kitãbu 'r-radd ‘alã Shayṭãni 'ṭ-Ṭãq*.[224] The book itself has not come down to us so that we might know whom Hishãm intended by 'Shayṭãnu 'ṭ-Ṭãq,' and those who mention the book as his do not elaborate on it. Perhaps the explanation that suggests itself at first glance is that the person intended is Mu’minu 'ṭ-Ṭãq, Abū Ja‘far al-Bajalī, previously mentioned alongside Hishãm al-Jawãlīqī and al-Maythamī; but I have serious doubts about this explanation. Rather, I am almost certain of its incorrectness, and that it is a mistaken explanation.

The scholars of the Imãmiyyah agreed that the naming by Abū Ja‘far of al-Aḥwal al-Bajalī as 'Shayṭãnu 'ṭ-Ṭãq' came in the first place from the adversaries of the Imãmiyyah, and that the Imãmiyyah called him 'Mu’minu 'ṭ-Ṭãq'[225]. Others apart

---

[223] *Kitãbu 'r-radd ‘alã Hishãm al-Jawãlīqī*. aṭ-Ṭūsī, *al-Fihrist*, p.204; an-Najãshī, p.304; Ibnu 'n-Nadīm, p.224; *Ma‘ãlimu 'l-‘ulamã’*, p.115; *Majma‘u 'r-rijãl*, vol.6, pp.232, 233; *Īḍãḥu 'l-maknūn*, vol.2, p.298; *Hadiyyatu 'l-‘ãrifīn*, vol.2, p.508; *adh-Dharī‘ah*, vol.10, p.237.

[224] aṭ-Ṭūsī, p.204; an-Najãshī, p. 305; Ibnu 'n-Nadīm, p.224; *Ma‘ãlimu 'l-‘ulamã’*, p.115; *Majma‘u 'r-rijãl*, vol.6, pp.233, 234; *Hadiyyatu 'l-‘ãrifīn*, vol.2, p.507; *adh-Dharī‘ah*, vol.10, p.203.

[225] al-Kishshī, p.185; al-Barqī, *ar-Rijãl*, p.17; al-Mufīd, *al-lkhtiṣãṣ*, p.204; aṭ-Ṭūsī, *al-Fihrist*, p.157; *ar-Rijãl*, p.359; an-Najãshī, p.228; Ibn Shahrãshūb, *Ma‘ãlimu 'l-‘ulamã’*, p.115.

from the Imãmiyyah knew of this name of his, and related it on their authority.[226] They cite other nicknames: 'Shãh Ṭãq/Shãhu 'ṭ-Ṭãq' and 'Malaku 'ṭ-Ṭãq'.[227] Ibnu 'n-Nadīm said: "His followers called him Shãqu 'ṭ-Ṭãq as well."[228] Moreover, Ibn Ḥajar relates on the authority of Ibn Abī Ṭayyi', the famous Imãmī scholar, one of the beliefs concerning his being named 'Mu'minu 'ṭ-Ṭãq', something only he quotes from him:

> It is said that Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam, a *shaykh* of the Rãfiḍah, on hearing that they [the adversaries of the Imãmiyyah] had nicknamed him Shayṭãnu 'ṭ-Ṭãq, named him 'Mu'minu 'ṭ-Ṭãq'.[229]

This nickname, 'Mu'minu 'ṭ-Ṭãq', was not maintained for him after his time, but his contemporaries called him by it, and it is stated on the authority of Hishãm ibn Sãlim al-Jawãlīqī himself,[230] as also from Yūnus ibn Ya'qūb[231] Abãn ibn 'Uthmãn al-Aḥmar[232] Abū Mãlik al-Aḥmasī,[233] and Sharīk ibn 'Abdillãh an-Nakha'ī.[234]

It is really very unlikely that someone like Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam should give him this derisory nickname which the adversaries of the Imãmiyyah invented for him, and that the followers of the Imãmiyyah should counter them with another

---

[226] Ibnu 'n-Nadīm, p.224; adh-Dhahabī, *Siyar a'lãmi 'n-nubalã'*, vol.10, pp.553-4; aṣ-Ṣafadī, *al-Wãfī bi 'l-wafayãt*, vol.4, p.104; Ibn Ḥajar, *Lisãnu 'l-mīzãn*, vol.5, p.300; ash-Shahristãnī, *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal*, vol.1, p.186.

[227] aṭ-Ṭūsī, *al-Fihrist*, p.222; *ar-Rijãl*, p.302; *Majma'u 'r-rijãl*, vol.6, p.7.

[228] See *al-Fihrist*, Tajaddud ed., appendix, p.224, al-Istiqãmah ed., p.258.

[229] *Lisãnu 'l-mīzãn*, vol.5, pp.300-1.

[230] al-Kishshī, p.282; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.47, p.262. And in another *ḥadīth*, al-Kishshī, pp.275-7; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.47, pp.407-8.

[231] al-Kishshī, p.271.

[232] *al-Iḥtijãj*, vol.2, p.140; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.46, p.180.

[233] al-Kishshī, pp.186-8 – in three *ḥadīth*; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.47, pp.405-6.

[234] *al-Iḥtijãj*, vol.2, pp.144-8; *al-Biḥãr*, vol.47, pp.396-400.

nickname which was appropriate for a man of his prestige and rank. Rather, Hishãm himself would have been the one who began the opposition to them and chose 'Mu'minu 'ṭ-Ṭãq' for him, as previously mentioned in one of the beliefs regarding the reason for his being given this nickname. In addition to this, I have not found anything in the Imãmī *ḥadīth* which demonstrates the presence of adversity between Hishãm and Mu'minu 'ṭ-Ṭãq, nor any sort of clearly distinguishable divergence between them similar to the evidence which demonstrates a divergence between Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam and Hishãm al-Jawãlīqī. This sort of nicknaming has no justification, even when adversity and enmity is intensified, except in the case of insult and calumny. Indeed, I have previously mentioned, in a discussion about al-Jawãlīqī, that Mu'minu 'ṭ-Ṭãq and al-Maythamī followed al-Jawãlīqī in his ideas; a refutation of him is a refutation of both of them, and that is what Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam did.

Further to all this, there are the numerous indications in what I have mentioned in the biography of Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam of his good character, that he befriended an Ibãḍī Khãrijite in a way which lasted for years, which set an example of good companionship, and which was bestowed upon all opponents – as al-Jãḥiẓ states. This name-calling, arising from a level of character appropriate to someone who was not at Hishãm's level, is quite inconceivable for him.

On the basis of all this, and for other reasons, I am convinced that Hishãm, in this book of his, is refuting a person other than Mu'minu 'ṭ-Ṭãq to whom this nickname 'Shayṭãnu 'ṭ-Ṭãq' was given before Mu'minu 'ṭ-Ṭãq. This man's adversity towards the Imãmiyyah reached a point where Hishãm did not find it objectionable to nickname him with this sort of disgraceful nickname. However, the adversaries of the Imãmiyyah took the nickname out of context, and directed it at Mu'minu 'ṭ-Ṭãq,

because he lived in Ṭãq, in the region of Kūfah. He was called 'aṭ-Ṭãqī' or 'Ṣãḥibu 'ṭ-Ṭãq'.[235] The original holder of the nickname has been neglected to the point where we have forgotten him and this sort of obscurity came to pass.

Another piece of evidence which shows that this nickname was not only applied to Mu'minu 'ṭ-Ṭãq is that al-Khaṭīb gives the biography of a non-Imãmī narrator, and says: "Aḥmad ibn Hãrūn, known as Shayṭãnu 'ṭ-Ṭãq, from the people of Surra-man-ra'ã."[236]

29
THE IMÃMĪS' POSITION ON NON-IMÃMĪ *ḤADĪTH*

From this urgently needed study of ours it appears that those of the Imãmiyyah who were accused of corporealism and anthropomorphism, whether correctly or not, were accused on the basis of their belief in *ḥadīth* which had leaked over to them from the non-Imãmī sects, and we have given examples bearing witness to this. These *ḥadīth*s themselves were what led others to corporealism and anthropomorphism, knowingly or unknowingly; in this their views concurred, or at least those of their views which are narrated, although it is not proved that they, or some of them, believed in them.

As a single example of the effect of these *ḥadīth*s on the environment of the Imãmiyyah, in addition to the examples already given, there is what aṣ-Ṣadūq narrates with a chain of authority originating with Ya‘qūb as-Sarrãj, who stated:

> I said to Abū ‘Abdillãh, peace be upon him: 'Some of our followers claim that Allãh has a form like human form, and they also say that He is, in this form, beardless, with short,

[235] Refer to the sources already cited concerning his nickname.
[236] = Present-day Sãmarrã' in ‘Irãq: *Tãrīkh Baghdãd*, vol.5, p.196.

> curly hair [refer to what has been stated previous-ly].' Abū ‘Abdillāh, peace be upon him, fell to the ground, prostrated, and then he raised his head and said: 'Praise be to Allāh Who does not resemble anything, Who is not percieved by vision, and not bound by knowledge. *He did not beget*, because a son would resemble his father; *He was not begotten*, for whoever was before Him would resemble Him.'[237]

There is another factor, and it suffices that we mention just one piece of evidence for it without comment or explanation. This is what came from Ibn Abī ‘Umayr Muḥammad ibn Ziyād al-Azdī al-Baghdādī (d. 217/832), the famous Imāmī Traditionist and scholar, concerning what al-Kishshī narrated from al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān:

> He questioned Abū Muḥammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr, saying to him: 'You have met the non-Imāmī *shaykh*s, but how is it that you have not heeded them?' He said: 'I listened to them; however I saw that many of our followers had heard knowledge from the *‘āmmah* (non-Imāmīs) and from the *khāṣṣah* (the elite-Imāmīs), and that they had been confused to the point where they narrated a non-Imāmī *ḥadīth* from Imāmī sources and vice versa. I dreaded the thought of becoming confused, so I abandonned this and focussed on that' [i.e., 'I stopped narrating non-Imāmī *ḥadīth* and confined myself to Imāmī *ḥadīth*'].[238]

These two factors, in addition to others, explain the confidence which emanated from the Imāms, peace be upon them, and which their partisans had in taking their beliefs and rulings from them, as well as the reliance upon the truthful and trustworthy people who narrated on their authority. May Allāh

---

[237] *at-Tawḥīd*, pp.103-4; *al-Biḥār*, vol.3, p.304.

[238] al-Kishshī, pp.590-1; *Majma‘u 'r-rijāl*, vol.5, p.118; *Mu‘jam rijāli 'l-ḥadīth*, vol.14, p.299.

forgive our brothers for explaining it as a rupture between Muslim brethren, and transforming it into an indictment, to be added to the other indictments against us!

It is clear from this study of ours that the adversaries of the Imãmiyyah, no matter how their views differed or their beliefs varied, did not cease to behave towards the Imãmiyyah as they did, or as it was claimed they did, concerning what was between them. I have presented many examples of this, and have refrained from commenting on them. However, here I will relate the opinion of a non-Imãmī writer concerning one of the most famous books on treatises and sects, to which Muslims of all periods have accorded a high status among all books on the subject. The book is *al-Farq bayna 'l-firaq wa bayãnu 'l-firqati 'n-nãjiyyah minhã* by Abū Manṣūr, ‘Abdu 'l-Qãhir ibn Ṭãhir al-Baghdãdī, al-Ash‘arī, ash-Shãfi‘ī (d. 429/1038), and in the same vain, his other book *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal*, both in print; and another book of no less importance, if not as successful, being *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal* by Abu 'l-Fatḥ, Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdi 'l-Karīm ash-Shahristãnī (479/1086–548/1153). Fakhru 'd-Dīn ar-Rãzī, the famous theologian and commentator, says of the book *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal* by ash-Shahristãnī:

> It is a book which, it claims, relates the doctrines of the world, but it is not relied upon because it draws Islamic beliefs from the book called *al-Farq bayna 'l-firaq* by Abū Manṣūr al-Baghdãdī, and this teacher was severely bigoted against those who differed in belief and scarcely presented their beliefs in a truthful fashion. ash-Shahris-tãnī, then, drew the beliefs of the Muslim sects from this book, and for this reason slandered their honour in the process.[239]

* * * * *

[239] *Munãẓarãt Fakhru 'd-Dīn ar-Rãzī fī bilãd mã warãi 'n-nahr*, ed. Dr. Fatḥullãh Khalīf, Dãru 'l-Mashriq, Beirut, 1966, with English transl., p.39-99; and see the translation, p.62-99.

Before concluding the investigation, I must say a word concerning the role of the Muʻtazilah in this area. The Muʻtazilah were confronted from the beginning by two sorts of adversaries: one group were followers of *ḥadīth* and the *sunnah*, or those who were called al-Ḥashwiyyah and an-Nãbitah by the Muʻtazilah, and the second group were the theologians who differed with them in their views. The Traditionists did not confront the Muʻtazilah with the weapons of theology and debate and join the battle of argument with argument, but rather confronted them with accusations of heresy and unbelief, and the charge of atheism and going beyond the legitimate bounds of the religion. With the influence they had on the general public, their adversity was transformed into a mere 'physical struggle', in which the Muʻtazilah were compelled to grasp the weapon of authority since they had failed to grasp the weapon of the backing of the general public. The most important manifestations were the tragedies in which the history of the time of the ʻAbbãsids al-Ma'mūn, al-Muʻtaṣim, al-Wãthiq, and al-Mutawakkil (198/813–247/861) abound. The Muʻtazilah were victorious in the first period of the third caliphate, as they had the authority and the weapons of the sultan on their side. This is a tragedy, which the historians hold to have been a struggle over the issue of the createdness of the Qur'ãn. However the Muʻtazilah lost their position after the authorities inclined towards their opponent theologians, and they lost the weapon of authority, just as their predecessors had lost the weapon of the general public.

As for their theological adversaries – the most important of these were the Imãmī theologians – the controversy the Muʻtazilah had with them took place merely in the intellectual arena, since the disputing parties were, as was pointed out,

equal in strength, in posession neither of the weapon of the sultan or of the community. Rather, the Mu‘tazilah were, with respect to the Imãmiyyah, closer to the heart of the sultan and his sympathy, and more able to seek the aid of his influence and arms! Here the Mu‘tazilah sought assistance by all reason and means, and pursued every avenue, which facilitated their victory. It was fear of the public in the first instance, and following that, fear of both the public and the sultan, which shackled the hands of the Mu‘tazilah in front of the Traditionists; this did not shackle their hands before the Imãmiyyah, and for this reason we do not find in the books of the Mu‘tazilah concerned with the Traditionists the offensive accusations, the continual biting criticism, and the bare-faced adversity which we find they have with respect to the Imãmiyyah.

I think that what the Mu‘tazilah attributed to the Imãmiyyah, which others adopted from them, they heard in the first instance from the Traditionists. Muqãtil ibn Sulaymãn settled in Baṣrah towards the end of his life, and spread his views there,[240] and so did his contemporary Ḥammãd ibn Salamah al-Baṣrī (88/707–167/784), the *muftī* and *faqīh* of Baṣrah, and a famous Traditionist. He was the one with whom are associated most of the *ḥadīth* concerning the divine attributes which he used to demonstrate corporealism and anthropomorphism, and which it was said that his confederate ‘Abdu 'l-Karīm ibn Abi 'l-‘Awjã’, the well-known atheist, inserted in his own books, and which Ḥammãd narrated and defended as true.[241] Mu‘ãdh al-‘Anbarī, the *qãḍī* and Traditionist of Baṣrah, and Dãwūd al-

[240] As was previously mentioned, according to adh-Dhahabī 'Baṣrah is a nest of predestination': *Mīzãnu 'l-i‘tidãl*, vol.3, p.91.

[241] Ibnu 'l-Jawzī, *al-Mawḍū‘ãt*, vol.1, pp.37, 100, 122; Ibn Fūrak, *Mushkilu 'l-ḥadīth*, p.169; al-Bayhaqī, *al-Asmã’ wa 'ṣ-ṣifãt*, p.445; adh-Dhahabī, *Mīzãnu 'l-i‘tidãl*, vol.l, p.593; Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhību 't-tahdhīb*, vol.3, p.15; as-Suyūṭī, *al-La’ãli 'l-maṣnū‘ah*, vol.1, p.25; vol.2, p.468; etc.

Jawãribī were either from Baṣrah or had connections with it. The Muʻtazilah took everything from them, but they could not at first ridicule them using these narrations, so they used their statements against the Imãmiyyah, attributing them to the Baṣrans in the first instance, and the using it to ridicule them afterwards.

30
COMPARISON OF THE *TAṢḤĪḤU 'L-IʻTIQÃD* WITH THE *IʻTIQÃDÃTU 'L-IMÃMIYYAH*

The final point I wish to mention is that the comparison of *Taṣḥīḥu 'l-iʻtiqãd* by al-Mufīd with *Iʻtiqãdãtu 'l-Imãmiyyah* by aṣ-Ṣadūq only reveals to us what the Imãmiyyah Traditionist and theological schools shared, and what they differed in, and no more, during the period up to the fifth/eleventh century. However, to conclude this comparison by saying that the difference, which we find on al-Mufid's side, can be traced back to the influence of the Muʻtazilah is an inference, which is refuted by many facts resting on correct deduction based on truthful and comprehensive study.

The Imãmiyyah, from the beginning, contained these two schools of thought. We have stated that while they were different in style and form of demonstration, they were not adversarial opponents, as we have found them to be among the non-Imãmī. I have elsewhere written a continuous history of Imãmī theologians, in which I trace them up to the period of Shaykhu 'ṭ-Ṭãifah aṭ-Ṭūsī, and I have mentioned the books of theology that are cited as theirs; it will be published, Allãh willing, as a preface to the English translation of "Kitãbu 't-Tawḥīd" of *Uṣūl al-Kãfī*. However, the books which I have cited there have mostly perished, and only a trifling amount has reached us; nevertheless, they have titles, and what these titles suggest dem-

onstrates that Imãmī theology is a continuous, uninterrupted chain, which thrived and was maintained up to the time of the Shaykh al-Mufīd. Where we do not have actual examples, the least we can do is study their titles and what little remains of their contents. Our study is, therefore, fragmented and incomplete, and it is not correct for us to judge that what we see as a distinctive feature of al-Mufīd is something he picked up from the Muʻtazilah. Rather, there are proofs, which demonstrate that this distinctive feature was something that had been passed down to him from previous Imãmī theologians, in the same way as their doctrine, which he inherited with its special characteristics. I have already presented some of the discussion surrounding the methodological division between Traditionist and theological styles. It is apparent from this that these strong judgements, which have been stated both in the past and at the present, concerning the influence of the Muʻtazilah on the Imãmiyyah, are unfounded. I have made it clear that they were not influenced by the Muʻtazilah in their beliefs; this was my intention in this introduction, and as for the study of other aspects, I leave that task to another time.

However, I would like to put forward here a single example of these biting judgements, being the least weighty of examples, and the least outrageous and arbitrary in its connection with aṣ-Ṣadūq and al-Mufīd. M. McDermott mentions that the *Kitãbu 't-Tawḥīd* by aṣ-Ṣadūq was composed later than his two other books, *al-Iʻtiqãdãtu 'l-Imãmiyyah* and *al-Hidãyah*, and that aṣ-Ṣadūq was therein closer to the thinking of the Muʻtazilah than he was in the other two, since after aṣ-Ṣadūq had emigrated to Rayy, he lived in the Buyid court there. Perhaps this difference was due to 'the pressure of the vizier aṣ-Ṣãḥib ibn ʻAbbãd[242] or the influence of Muʻtazilite arguments may well have changed

[242] Vizier to the Būyids (326/938–385/995).

his thinking.'[243]

But there is more weighty evidence from an earlier period. al-Kulaynī, the Shaykh Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qūb ar-Rãzī, then al-Baghdãdī (d. 329/941), was a Traditionist *shaykh* of the Imãmiyyah who lived in Rayy and then moved to Baghdad at the end of his life and died there.[244] al-Kulaynī gave a chapter in the section on *tawḥīd* in *al-Kãfī* the title *Ta'wīlu 'ṣ-ṣamad* (the interpretation of *ṣamad*), and quoted there two *ḥadīth* which explained *ṣamad* as His eternal mastery over everything, great or small,[245] and then went on to state:

> This is the correct interpretation of *aṣ-ṣamad*, not what anthropomorphism holds about it: that the interpretation of *aṣ-ṣamad* is a solid, which has no void within it. That interpretation is nothing more than an attribute of bodies, and Allãh, glory be to His name, is above this; . . . if the interpretation of *aṣ-ṣamad* as an attribute of Allãh were solidity, then it would contradict His words: *there is no thing like Him* (ash-Shūrã, 42:11), because solidity is an attribute of solid bodies which have no voids, like stone, or iron, or other solid objects . . . And as for what is stated in Tradition concerning this matter, the knower (i.e., the infallible Imãm), peace be upon him, is more knowledgeable by what he said.

He then goes on to demonstrate the correctness of this explanation with a linguistic argument;[246] in this way he anticipated the Shaykhu 'ṭ-Ṭūsī, the student of al-Mufīd, by many centuries. aṭ-Ṭūsī said:

> Whoever interprets *aṣ-ṣamad* to mean 'solid' is ignorant of

---

[243] *The Theology of ash-Shaikh al-Mufid*, pp.323, 341-9.

[244] For his biography see the forward to the English translation of "Kitābu 'l-‘Aql wa 'l-Jahl" from *al-Kãfī*.

[245] *al-Kãfī*, vol.1, pp.123-4, nos.323/324.

[246] *al-Kãfī*, vol.1, p.124.

Allãh, because solidity is the compression of parts, and that, which has no voids; this is anthropomorphism and unbelief in Allãh.[247]

Those Traditions which al-Kulaynī indicates but does not quote and which explain *aṣ-ṣamad* as that which has no voids, aṣ-Ṣadūq cites and does not miss out in his *Kitãbu 't-Tawḥīd*, in which, according to McDermott, he was more influenced by the Mu‘tazilah than in his *Risãlah*, or his *Hidãyah*,[248] and he combines it with the meaning which al-Kulaynī adopted as explaining *aṣ-ṣamad*, and takes on both of them. He interprets *aṣ-ṣamad* in a way, which does not lend itself to corporeal-ism;[249] from this it appears that al-Kulaynī was more of a Mu‘tazilah than aṣ-Ṣadūq!

It may be that the reverential support given to these judgements which have been expounded about the Imãmiyyah both ancient and modern, and which opine that they were dependant on the Mu‘tazilah who provided them with their views and arguments will lead some to claim that another Mu‘tazilī circle existed or came into existence, and that al-Kulaynī lived within it, and that another Mu‘tazilī vizier put pressure upon him. I do not, in any way, deny that an Imãmī scholar can be influenced by a teacher of his who differs from him in belief, or by the atmosphere of adversity around him, but what I do not accept is what McDermott's opinion is inspired by, being that aṣ-Ṣadūq renounced some of his ideas, or covered up aspects of them in deference to his followers or to the Mu‘tazilah, and this continued reverence for these judgements which state that any modification of Imãmī opinion occured as a result of Mu‘tazilī influence upon them. In the view of aṣ-Ṣadūq, aṣ-Ṣãḥib ibn ‘Abbãd was not that Mu‘tazilī whom the Mu‘tazilī sources

[247] *at-Tibyãn*, vol.10, p.431.
[248] *at-Tawḥīd*, pp.93, 140, 171.
[249] *Ibid.*, p.197.

suppose him to be. Rather he was a Twelver Imãmī who eulogized the Imãms, particularly ar-Riḍã, peace be upon him, in many *qaṣīda*s, in which he explicitly refers to their Imãmate. aṣ-Ṣadūq wrote his *ʻUyūn akhbãri 'r-Riḍã, ʻalay-hi 's-salãm* for him, and explicitly mentions him in the beginning of the book. Moreover, he quotes the poems of aṣ-Ṣãḥib therein.[250]

*   *   *   *   *

In issues of theology, it is necessary to distinguish between those which touch directly upon belief, and those, which do not, such as those issues, which come under the heading of the *laṭīf* (refinements) of *kalãm*. Our Shaykh al-Mufīd cites many of these kinds of elaborations at the end of his *Awãilu 'l-maqãlãt*.[251] My goal in this introduction is limited to stating that the Imãmiyyah did not take their beliefs from the Muʻtazilah, and that anthropomorphism and corporealism did not reign over them for a single day prior to their contact with the Muʻtazilah. As for being influenced in issues like these, or being influenced in the type of demonstration used in issues connected with them, I do not rule it out; rather, there is much evidence for its occurence, but there was a two-way influence. What is most distressing is the ignorance of the influence Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam had on the two Muʻtazilī scholars, an-Naẓẓãm and Abū Ṭayyib, for example, and the importance given to al-Mufīd's being influenced by the Mu'tazilah.

As for the extent of the Muʻtazill influence on al-Mufīd, in particular, in matters of the *laṭīfu 'l-kalãm* in questions which did not touch directly upon doctrine, and especially al-Mufīd's pursuance of the ideas of al-Kaʻbī al-Balkhī, which McDermott uses freely in his book *The Theology of ash-Shaikh al-Mufīd*, I

[250] *'Uyūnu 'l-akhbãr*, vol.1, pp.3-7.
[251] p.72 ff.

shall not discuss anything he states, since I have discussed the principles which he relies upon and given my opinion of them; as for the details, a discussion of them would form another article.

It should also be pointed out that taking from a non-Imãmī theologian does not necessarily mean that a student follows his teacher's opinions, especially as far as doctrinal differences he has with him are concerned. The non-Imãmī theologians of the earlier time were Mu'tazilī, and following the period of the Shaykhu 'ṭ-Ṭãifah aṭ-Ṭūsī, were mostly Ash'arī; a group of our Imãmī theologians were involved with them. In addition, and in contrast to this, there is the recorded involvement of non-Imãmī with Imãmī theologians, such as the students of Naṣīru 'd-Dīn aṭ-Ṭūsī, the famous theologian and philosopher. This is only the acquisition of information from a non-Imãmī *shaykh*; how many non-Imãmī *shaykh*s of *ḥadīth* there were from whom al-Mufīd, al-Murtaḍã, aṭ-Ṭūsī, and al-Karãjikī learnt, not to mention those who preceeded them, like aṣ-Ṣadūq, and those who succeeded them, like the 'Allãmah al-Ḥillī. These men weighed the *ḥadīth* they heard with the scales they held to be correct; in their view, it was a necessity for them to reveal the soundness or otherwise of a *ḥadīth*. The result of this is that the lmãmī Traditionist sought the assistance of what he heard from his non-Imãmī *shaykh* in substantiating what he believed about the Imãmate, and the qualifications of the Imãms, peace be upon them, or in the refutation of arguments of adversaries. This is the case as well in the sciences of theology, Qur'ãnic commentary, positive law, and jurisprudence. This sort of involvement was beneficial, in the first instance, in learning the usefulness of what the two sides agreed upon, and secondly, in making use of the teacher's knowledge in defense of what the student believed to be true.

* * * * *

BIBLIOGRAPHY

and

INDEX

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABŪ DÃWŪD, Sulaymãn ibn al-Ash'ath al-Azdī as-Sijistãnī, (202/817–275/889); *as-Sunan*, 4vols., Cairo, n.d.

ABU 'L-FIDÃ', 'Imãdu 'd-Dīn, Ismã'īl ibn 'Alī ibn Maḥmūd al-Ayyūbī (672/1273–7321338), *at-Tãrīkh (al-Mukhtaṣar fī akhbãri 'l-bashar)*, Beirut, n.d.

ABŪ ḤAYYÃN AL-UNDULUSĪ, Athīru 'd-Dīn, Ibn Ḥayyãn, Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf al-Gharnãṭī ash-Shãfi'ī (654/1256–745/1344), *al-Baḥrū 'l-muḥīṭ*, (n.p.or d.).

ABŪ NU'AYM AL-IṢBAHÃNĪ, Aḥmad ibn 'Abdillãh ibn Aḥmad ash-Shãfi'ī (336/948–430/1038), *Ḥilyatu 'l-awliyã'*, Cairo, 1933.

ÃGHÃ BUZURG AT-TIHRÃNĪ, Muḥammad Muḥsin, *adh-Dharī'ah ilã taṣãnifi 'sh-Shī'ah*, 20 vols., Tehran: Islãmiyyah, 1936-70.

AḤMAD, Abū 'Abdillãh, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥanbal ash-Shaybãnī (164/780–241/855), *al-Musnad*, Cairo, 1368 AH.

AL-ÃJURRĪ, Abū Bakr, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Abdillãh al-Baghdãdī ash-Shãfi'ī (d. 360/970), *ash-Sharī'ah*, (n.p.or d.).

'ALĪ IBN IBRÃHĪM, *at-Tafsīr*, (n.p.or d.).

AL-ÃLŪSĪ, Abu 'th-Thanã', Shihãbu 'd-Dīn, Maḥmūd ibn 'Abdillãh al-Baghdãdī ash-Shãfi'ī (1217/1802–1270/1854), *Rūḥu 'l-ma'ãnī*, 30 vols., Cairo, n.d.

AL-ANBÃRĪ, 'Abdu 'r-Raḥmãn ibn Muḥammad (513/1119–577/1181), *Nuzhatu 'l-alibbã' (fī ṭabaqãti 'l-udabã')*, Hayderabad, 1344 AH.

AL-ANṢÃRĪ, ash-Shaykh Murtaḍã, (1214/1800–1281/1864), *Farīdu 'l-uṣūl* (famous as *ar-Rasãil*), offset, Tehran, 1377 H.

AL-‘ARŪSĪ, ash-Shaykh ‘Abd ‘Alī ibn Jumu‘ah al-Ḥuwayzī (11th/17th c.), *Nūru 'th-thaqalaynī*, (n.p.or d.).

AL-ASH‘ARĪ, Abu 'l-Ḥasan, ‘Alī ibn Ismã‘īl ibn Abī Bishr al-Baṣrī (260/874 or 270/883–324/936), *Maqalãtu 'l-Islãmiyyīn wa ikhtilãfi 'l-muṣallīn*, edited by H. Ritter, Istanbul, 1929 (2 vols. with continuous pagination).

AL-‘AYNĪ AL-ḤANAFĪ, *‘Umdatu 'l-qãrī fī sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥi 'l-Bukhãrī*, Cairo, n.d.

BADAWĪ, ‘Abdu 'r-Raḥmãn, Dr., *Madhãhibu 'l-Islãmiyyīn*, (n.p.or d.).

AL-BAGHDÃDĪ, Abū Manṣūr, ‘Abdu 'l-Qãhir ibn Ṭãhir, *al-Farq bayna 'l-firaq*, edited by M. al-Kawtharī, Cairo, 1948.

— *Hadiyyatu 'l-ãrifīn*, (n.p.or d.).

— *Uṣūlu 'd-dīn*, Istanbul, 1928.

AL-BAḤRÃNĪ, as-Sayyid Hãshim ibn Sulaymãn ibn Ismã‘īl al-Ḥusaynī, (d. 1107/1696), *al-Burhãn fī tafsīri 'l-Qur'ãn*, (n.p.or d.).

BALÃDHURĪ, Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyã ibn Jãbir (d. 279/892), *Futūḥu 'l-buldan*, 3 vols., Cairo, (n.d.).

— *Ansãbu 'l-ashrãf*, Cairo, 1955.

AL-BALKHĪ, AL-KA‘BĪ, Abu 'l-Qãsim, ‘Abdullãh ibn Aḥmad ibn Maḥmūd al-Mu‘tazilī, al-Ḥanafī, *Dhikru 'l-Mu‘tazilah*, (n.p.or d.).

AL-BARQĪ, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Khãlid (d. 274/887), *ar-Rijãl*, MSS.

BÃSHÃ AL-BAGHDÃDĪ, Ismã‘īl (d. 1339 AH), 2 vols., Beirut, Dãr Iḥyã' at-Turãthi 'l-‘Arabī, n.d.

AL-BAYHAQĪ, Abū Bakr, Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn an-Naysãbūrī ash-Shãfi‘ī (384/994–458/1066), *al-Asmã' wa 'ṣ-ṣifãt*, (n.p.or d.).

AL-BUKHÃRĪ, Abū ‘Abdillãh, Muḥammad ibn Ismã‘īl (194/810–256/870), *Tãrīkhu 'l-kabīr*, (n.p.or d.).

AD-DÃRIMĪ, Abū Muḥammad, ‘Abdullãh ibn ‘Abdi 'r-Raḥmãn as-Samarqandī (181/797–255/869), *ar-Radd ‘alã Bishr al-Marrīsī, ‘Aqãid as-Salaf*, pub. by Dr. ‘Alī Sãmī an-Nashshãr, ‘Ammãr Jam‘ī aṭ-Ṭãlibī, Munsha'atu 'l-Ma‘ãrif, Alexanderia, Egypt, 1971.

— *as-Sunan*, (n.p.or d.).

ADH-DHAHABĪ, Shamsu 'd-Dīn, Abū ‘Abdillãh, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad

ibn ‘Uthmãn ad-Dimashqī ash-Shãfi‘ī (673/1274–748/ 1347); *Kitãb al-‘Ibar (fī khabar man khabar)*, edited by Ṣalãḥu 'd-Dīn al-Munajjid, Kuwait: Maṭba‘at Ḥukūmat al-Kuwayt, 1960-6.

— *Mīzãnu 'l-i‘tidãl (fī naqḍi 'r-rijãl)*, edited by ‘Alī al-Bajãwī, Cairo, ‘Īsã al-Ḥalabī, 1963.

— *Siyar a‘lãmi 'n-nubalã'*, 25 vols., edited by Dr. Bashshãr ‘Awwãd Ma‘rūf and Dr. Muḥyi 'l-Hilãl as-Sarḥãn, Beirut: Muassasatu 'r-Risãlah, 1413/1993.

— *Tadhkiratu 'l-ḥuffãẓ*, Hyderabad, 1333AH.

Encyclopaedia of Islam, *The*, new ed. E.J. Brill, 1983.

FATḤULLÃH KHALĪF, DR., *Munãẓarãt Fakhru 'd-Dīn ar-Rãzī fī bilãd mã warãi 'n-nahr*, Dãru 'l-Mashriq, Beirut, 1966.

AL-FIRŪZ-ÃBÃDĪ, *al-Qãmūs*, 4 vols., Cairo, n.d.

AL-ḤÃKIM, Abū ‘Abdillãh, Ibnu 'l-Bayyi‘ Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdillãh an-Naysãbūrī ash-Shãfi‘ī (321/933–405/1014), *al-Mustadrak ‘ala 'ṣ-ṣaḥīḥayn*, Hyderabad, 1335 AH.

AL-ḤALABĪ, *as-Sīrah al-Ḥalabiyyah*, 3 vols., Cairo, n.d.

AL-HARAWĪ, ‘Alī al-Qãrī al-Ḥanafī (d. 1014 AH), *al-Mirqãt fī sharḥi 'l-mishkãt*, (n.p.or d.).

AL-ḤASANĪ AZ-ZAYDĪ, Yaḥyã ibn al-Ḥusayn, an-Nãṭiq bi 'l-Ḥaqq, *Taysīru 'l-maṭãlib fī amãli 'l-Imãm Abī Ṭãlib*, Mu'assasat al-A‘lamī, Beirut, Lebanon, 1395/1975.

AL- ḤILLĪ, AL-‘ALLÃMAH, Jamãlu 'd-Dīn, Abū Manṣūr, al-Ḥasan ibn Yūsuf ibn ‘Alī ibn Muṭahhar al-Asadī (648/1250–726/1325); *Khulãṣatu 'l-aqwãl*, Qum, 1411 AH.

AL-ḤIMYARĪ, Abu 'l-‘Abbãs, ‘Abdullãh ibn Ja‘far ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Qummī, (d.ca. 297/910); *al-Ḥūru 'l-‘īn*, ed. K. Muṣṭafã, Cairo, 1948.

— *ar-Rawḍu 'l-mi‘ṭãr*, 2 vols., Cairo, 1937.

AL-ḤUSAYN IBN SA‘ĪD, *al-Mu'min*, (n.p.or d.).

IBN ABI 'L-ḤADĪD, ‘Izzu 'd-Dīn, ‘Abdu 'l-Ḥamīd ibn Hibbatillãh (Abū Ḥãmid), (586/1190–655/1257); *Sharḥ Nahju 'l-balãghah*, 20 vols.,

edited by M. Abu 'l-Faḍl Ibrãhīm, Cairo, 2nd ed., 1959.

IBN 'ABDI 'L-ḤAYY, *Shadharãtu 'dh-dhahab*, (n.p.or d.).

IBN 'ABD RABBIH, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Qurūbī, al-Mãlikī (246/860–328/940), *al-'Iqdu 'l-Farīd*, Board of Writing, Translation, and Publication, Cairo, 2nd ed., 1381/ 1962.

IBN ABĪ ḤÃTIM, Abū Muḥammad, 'Abdu 'r-Raḥmãn ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥanẓalī ar-Rãzī (240/854–327/938), *al-Jarḥ wa 't-ta'dīl*, (n.p.or d.).

IBN 'ASÃKIR, Abu 'l-Qãsim, 'Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Hibatillãh ad-Dimashqī ash-Shãfi'ī (499/1105–571/1176), *Tãrīkh madīnat Dimashq*, 70, vols., Dãru 'l-Fikr, Beirut, 1415 AH.

IBNU 'L-ATHĪR, 'Izzu 'd-Dīn, Abu 'l-Ḥasan, 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Jazarī ash-Shãfi'ī (555/1160–630/1233); *al-Lubãb fī tahdhībi 'l-ansãb*, 3 vols., Cairo, 1356/1937.

— *Usdu 'l-ghãbah*, Cairo, n.d.

IBNU 'L-FARRÃ', *Ṭabaqãtu 'l-Ḥanãbilah*, 2 vols., Egypt, (n.d.).

IBN FŪRAK, *Mushkilu 'l-ḥadīth*, (n.p.or d.).

IBN ḤAJAR AL-'ASQALÃNĪ, Shihãbu 'd-Dīn, Abu 'l-Faḍl Aḥmad ibn 'Alī ibn Muḥammad ash-Shãfi'ī (773/1372–852/1449), *Fatḥu 'l-bãrī (fī Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥu 'l-Bukhãrī)*, Cairo, 1378 AH.

— *al-Iṣãbah fī ma'rifati 'ṣ-ṣaḥãbah*, Cairo, n.d.

— *Lisãnu 'l-mīzãn*, Hyderabad, 1329/1911.

— *Tahdhību 't-tahdhīb,* Hyderabad, 1325-7/ 1907-9.

— *Taqrību 't-tahdhīb*, (n.p.or d.).

IBN ḤAZM, Abū Muḥammad, 'Alī ibn Aḥmad, *al-Fiṣal fi 'l-milal wa 'l-ahwã' wa 'n-niḥal*, offset print, Dãru 'l-Ma'rifah, Beirut, 1395/ 1975.

IBN ḤIBBÃN, Abū Ḥãtim, Muḥammad ibn Ḥibbãn at-Tamīmī al-Bustī ash-Shãfi'ī (270/884–354/965), *Kitãbu 'l-Majrūḥīn (aḍ-Ḍu'afã').*

— *ath-Thiqãt*, (n.p.or d.).

IBN HISHÃM, *as-Sīrah (an-Nabawiyyah)*, Cairo, 1355-56 AH.

IBN 'IMÃD AL-ḤANBALĪ, *Shadharãtu 'dh-dhahab*, Cairo, 1350 AH.

IBNU 'L-JAWZĪ, Abu 'l-Faraj, 'Abdu 'r-Raḥmãn ibn Aḥmad, *Daf' shubahi 't-tashbīh bi-akuffi 't-tanzīh*, al-Maktabah at-Tawfīqiyyah, Cairo, 1976.

— *al-Mawḍū'ãt*, (n.p.or d.).

— *al-Muntaẓam fī tãrīkhi 'l-mulūk wa 'l-umam*, Hyderabad: Dãiratu 'l-Ma‘ãrifi 'l-‘Uthmãniyyah, 1358 H.
— *Tablīs Iblīs*, al-Munīriyyah Press, Cairo, 1368.
— *Zãdu 'l-masīr*, (n.p.or d.).
IBNU 'L-JAZARĪ, *Ṭabaqãtu 'l-qurrã'*, (n.p.or d.).
IBN KATHĪR, ‘Imãdu 'd-Dīn, Abu 'l-Fidã', Ismã‘īl ibn ‘Umar ad-Dimashqī (701/1302–774/1373), *al-Bidãyah wa 'n-nihãyah*, Cairo, 1351/1932.
— *Tafsīru 'l-Qur'ãni 'l-‘Aẓīm*, Cairo, n.d.
IBN KHUZAYMAH, *at-Tawḥīd wa ithbãt ṣifati 'r-rabb*, revised and commented upon by Muḥammad Khalīl Harãs, al-Azhar University Library, Cairo, 1387/1968.
IBN MANẒŪR, Abu 'l-Faḍl, *Lisãnu 'l-‘Arab*, Cairo, n.d.
IBNU 'L-MURTAḌÃ, Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyã, *al-Baḥru 'z-zakhkhãr*, (n.p.or d.).
— *al-Munyah wa 'l-amal*, edited by Arnold, Sir Thomas, Hyderabad, 1316 AH.
IBNU 'N-NADĪM, Abu 'l-Faraj, Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qūb, *al-Fihrist*, al-Istiqãmah ed., Cairo, n.d.
IBN NASHWÃN AL-ḤIMYARĪ, Abu 'l-‘Abbãs, ‘Abdullãh ibn Ja‘far ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Qummī, (d.ca. 297/910); *al-Ḥūru 'l-‘īn*, ed. Kamãl Muṣṭafã, Cairo, 1948.
IBNU 'L-QAYYIM, *Badãi‘u 'l-fawãid*, (n.p.or d.).
IBN QUTAYBAH, Abū Muḥammad, Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdillãh ibn Muslim ad-Dīnawarī (213/828–276/889), *Kitãbu 'l-Ma‘ãrif*, Cairo, n.d.
— *Ta'wīl mukhtalafi 'l-ḥadīth*, Cairo, (n.d.).
— *‘Uyūnu 'l-akhbãr*, Cairo, 1925-35.
IBN RÃHWAYH, Abū Ya‘qūb, Isḥãq ibn Ibrãhīm ibn Makhlad al-Ḥanẓalī al-Marwazī (161/778–238/853), *‘Ãriḍah al-aḥwadhī*, (n.p.or d.).
IBN SA‘D, Abū ‘Abdillãh Muḥammad, *aṭ-Ṭabaqãtu 'l-kabīr*, edited by Edward Sachau, Leiden: Brill, 1917.
IBN SHAHRÃSHŪB, Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Mãzandarãnī, *Ma‘ãlimu 'l-‘ulamã'*, edited by ‘Abbãs Iqbãl, Tehran, 1353/ 1934.
— *al-Manãqib (Manãqib Ãl Abī Ṭãlib)*, Qum, (n.d.).

IBN TAYMIYYAH, Abu 'l-‘Abbãs, Aḥmad ibn ‘Abdi 'l-Ḥalīm, Taqiyyu 'd-Dīn, *Minhãju 's-sunnah*, Cairo, Būlãq, 1321 AH.

— *al-Munãẓirah fi 'l-‘aqīdati 'l-Wãsiṭiyyah, Majmū‘atu 'r-rasãili 'l-kubrã*, Dãr Iḥyã’ at-Turãthi 'l-‘Arabī, Beirut, offprint 2, 1392/ 1972.

IBNU 'L-WARDĪ, *at-Tãrīkh (Tatimmatu 'l-mukhtaṣar fī akhbãri 'l-bashar)*, 2 vols., Beirut, n.d.

‘IRFÃN ‘ABDU 'L-ḤAMĪD, PROF., *The Emendation of A Shī‘ite Creed*, A translation of *Taṣḥīḥu 'l-I‘tiqãd*, of ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd, (336/ 948 or 338/950–413/1022), pub. by World Organization for Islamic Services [WOFIS], Tehran, 1424/2003.

AL-ISFARÃYĪNĪ, Abu 'l-Muẓaffar, ‘Imãdu 'd-Dīn, Shãfūr Ṭãhir ibn Muḥammad, *at-Tabṣīr fi 'd-dīn*, edited by M. Kawtharī, Cairo, al-Khãnjī, 1955.

AL-JÃḤIẒ, Abū ‘Uthmãn, ‘Amr ibn Baḥr, *al-Bayãn wa 't-tabyīn*, ed. ‘Abdu 's-Salãm Hãrūn, Cairo, 1960.

— *al-Ḥayawãn*, 7 vols., Cairo, 1938.

AL-KARÃJIKĪ, Abu 'l-Fatḥ, Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Uthmãn (*c* 369/ 950–449/1057), *Kanzu 'l-fawãid*, Tehran, lithograph, 1323 H.

AL-KHAFÃJĪ, *Sharḥu 'sh-Shifã*, (n.p.or d.).

KHALĪFAH IBN KHAYYÃṬ, *at-Tãrīkh*, ed. Suhayl Zakkãr, Cairo, 1967.

AL-KHAṬĪB AL-BAGHDÃDĪ, Abū Bakr, Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī ibn Thãbit ash-Shãfi‘ī (392/1002–463/1072), *Tãrīkh Baghdãd*, Cairo: al-Khãnjī, 1349/ 1931.

AL-KHAYYÃṬ, Abu 'l-Ḥusayn, ‘Abdu 'r-Raḥmãn ibn ‘Uthmãn, *Kitãbu 'l-Intiṣãr (wa 'r-radd ‘alã Ibnu 'r-Rawandī al-mulḥid),* edited with introduction by H. S. Nyberg, Beirut, 1957.

AL-KHÃZIN, ‘Alãu 'd-Dīn, ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Baghdãdī ash-Shãfi‘ī (678/1280–741/1341), *at-Tafsīr (Lubãbu 't-ta’wīl fī ma‘ãni 't-tanzīl)*, Cairo, 1375/1955.

AL-KHŪ’Ī, AS-SAYYID, Abu 'l-Qãsim, *Mu‘jam rijãli 'l-ḥadīth*, 22 vols., Beirut: Madīnatu 'l-‘Ilm, 1983.

AL-KHWÃRAZMĪ, Abū ‘Abdillãh, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad, *Mu‘tamid fī uṣūli 'd-dīn*, (n.p.or d.).

AL-KIRMĀNĪ, *al-Firaqu 'l-Islãmiyyah*, (n.p.or d.).

AL-KISHSHĪ, Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar ibn ‘Abdi 'l-‘Azīz, *Ma‘rifat akhbãri 'r-rijãl*, Bombay, 1317 AH.

AL-KŪHBÃ'Ī, *Majma‘u 'r-rijãl*, (n.p.or d.).

AL-KULAYNĪ, Abū Ja‘far, Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qūb ibn Isḥãq ar-Rãzī, *al-Kãfī fī ‘ilmi 'd-dīn*, new edition, Tehran, 1381 AH.

LE STRANGE, G., *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphat*, pub. by Frank Cass & Co. Ltd., 1966.

AL-MAJLISĪ, Muḥammad Bãqir, *Biḥãru 'l-anwãr*, edited by M. H. aṭ-Ṭabãṭabã'ī, Tehran, 1376/1957.

— *Mir'ãtu 'l-‘uqūl*, Dãru 'l-Kutubi 'l-Islãmiyyah, Tehran: Maṭba‘atu 'l-Ḥaydarī, 1394 H.

AL-MAQDISĪ, Muṭahhar ibn Ṭãhir, *al-Bad' wa 't-tãrīkh*, edited by C. Huart, Paris, 1899/1919.

AL-MAQRĪZĪ, Taqiyyu 'd-Dīn, Abu 'l-‘Abbãs, Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Abdi 'l-Qãdir al-Miṣrī al-Ḥanafī (769/1367–845/1441), *al-Khiṭaṭ*, Būlãq (Cairo), 1270 AH.

AL-MAS‘ŪDĪ, ‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn, *Murūju 'dh-dhahab*, Paris offset.

AL-MAZZĪ, *Tahdhību 'l-kamãl*, (n.p.or d.).

MCDERMOTT, M.J., *The Theology of al-Shaikh al-Mufīd*, Dãr al-Mashriq, Beirut, 1978.

AL-MUFĪD, ASH-SHAYKH, Abū ‘Abdillãh, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn an-Nu‘mãn al-Ḥãrithī, Ibnu 'l-Mu‘allim, *Awãilu 'l-maqãlãt fi 'l-madhãhib wa 'l-mukhtãrãt*, 2nd ed., Tabrīz, 1371 H.

— *al-Fuṣūlu 'l-mukhtãrah (mina 'l-‘uyūn wa 'l-maḥãsin)*, 3rd ed., an-Najaf al-Ashraf [Iraq], al-Ḥaydariyyah, 1950.

— *al-Ikhtiṣãṣ*, edited by ‘Alī Akbar al-Ghaffãrī, Tehran Maktabatu 'ṣ-Ṣadūq, 1379H.

AL-MURTAḌÃ, ASH-SHARĪF (or as-Sayyid), Abu 'l-Qãsim, ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, ‘Alamu 'l-Hudã al-Mūsawī (355/966–436/1044); *al-Amãlī*, edited by M. Abū Faḍl Ibrãhīm, Cairo, ‘Īsã al-Ḥalabī, 1954.

— *Dīwãn al-Murtaḍã*, (n.p.or d.).

— *ash-Shãfī fi 'l-imãmah*, Tehran, lithograph, 1301 H.

MUSLIM, Abu 'l-Ḥusayn, Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjãj an-Naysãbūrī (204/

820–261/875), *aṣ-Ṣaḥīḥ*, Cairo, n.d.

AL-MUTTAQĪ AL-HINDĪ, ‘Alãu 'd-Dīn, ‘Alī ibn Ḥusãmi 'd-Dīn (885/ 1480–975/1567), *Kanzu 'l-‘ummãl fī sunani 'l-aqwãl wa 'l-af‘ãl*, Hyderabad, 1388/198.

— *Muntakhabu 'l-kanz (Kanzu 'l-‘ummãl)*, (on the sidelines of *al-Musnad*, Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal), 6 vols., Cairo, n.d.

Nahju 'l-Balãghah, the commentary of Muḥammad ‘Abduh and Muḥammad Muḥyi 'd-Dīn ‘Abdu 'l-Ḥamid, al-Istiqãmah Press, Cairo.

AN-NAJÃSHĪ, Abū ‘Abbãs, Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī, *Kitãbu 'r-Rijãl*, (*al-Fihrist*), Bombay, 1317/1899.

AN-NASHSHÃR, ‘Alī Sãmī, Dr., *Nash’atu 'l-fikri 'l-falsafi fi 'l-Islãm*, 4th ed., Cairo, Dãru 'l-Ma‘ãrif, 1966.

AN-NAWAWĪ, Muḥyi 'd-Dīn, Abū Zakariyyah Yaḥyã ibn Sharaf ad-Dimashqī ash-Shãfi‘ī (631/1233–676/1277), *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim,* Cairo, (n.p.or d.).

AL-QÃḌĪ ‘ABDU 'L-JABBÃR ibn Aḥmad ibn ‘Abdi 'l-Jabbãr al-Hama-dãnī, al-Mu‘tazilī, ash-Shãfi‘ī (320/932–415/1025), *Faḍlu 'l-i‘tidãl wa dhikru 'l-Mu‘tazilah*, (n.p.or d.).

— *Sharḥu 'l-uṣūli 'l-khamsah*, edited by ‘Abdu 'l-Karīm ‘Uthmãn, Cairo: Wahba, 1965.

AL-QÃḌĪ, ‘AYYÃḌ, *ash-Shifã*, (n.p.or d.).

AL-QÃḌĪ MUJBIRU 'D-DĪN, Abi 'l-Yaman al-‘Alīmī, *al-Minhaju 'l-Aḥmad*, 4 vols., (n.p.or d.).

AL-QÃRĪ, *Sharḥu 'sh-Shifã*, (n.p.or d.).

AL-QASṬALÃNĪ, *al-Mawãhibu 'l-laddunniyyah*, (n.p.or d.).

AL-QURṬUBĪ, Abū ‘Abdillãh, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Anṣãrī, *al-Jãmi‘ li-aḥkãmi 'l-Qur’ãn*, 20 vols., Dãr Iḥyã’ Turãthu 'l-‘Arabī, Beirut, 1405/1985.

AR-RÃGHIB, Abu 'l-Qãsim, al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Mufaḍḍal al-Iṣfahãnī, (d. 502/1108), *Muḥãḍarãtu 'l-udabã’*, 4 vols., Beirut, (n.d.).

AṢ-ṢADŪQ, ASH-SHAYKH, Ibn Bãbawayh (or Ibn Bãbūyã), Abū Ja'far, Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Qummī (ca. 306/919–381/991); *al-Amãlī*, Tehran, 1380 H.

— *Faqīh man lã yaḥḍuruhu 'l-faqīh*, 4 vols., Tehran, 1390/1970.

— *I'tiqãdãtu 'l-Imãmiyyah*, trans. by A.A.A. Fyzee, *A Shī'ite Creed*, rev. ed. by WOFIS, Tehran, 1402/1982.

— *Kamãlu 'd-dīn wa tamãmi 'n-ni'mah*, Tehran, 1378/1958.

— *al-Khiṣãl*, Tehran, 1302 H.

— *Ma'ãni 'l-akhbãr*, Tehran, 1379 AH.

— *at-Tawḥīd*, edited by Hãshim al-Ḥusaynī, Tehran: Maktabatu 'ṣ-Ṣadūq, 1387/1967.

— *'Uyūn akhbãri 'r-Riḍã (a.s.)*; 2 vols., edited by M. al-Lãjiwardī, Qum: Dãru 'l-'Ilm, 1377/1957; and an-Najaf al-Ashraf: al-Maṭba'atu 'l-Ḥaydariyyah, 1390/1970.

AṢ-ṢAFADĪ, Ṣalãḥu 'd-Dīn, Khalīl ibn Aybak ibn 'Abdillãh, *al-Wãfī bi 'l-wafayãt*. Edited by H. Ritter, Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1931.

SAHĪR MUḤAMMAD MUKHTÃR, *at-Tajsīm 'inda 'l-Muslimīn*, (n.p.or d.)

AS-SAM'ÃNĪ, Abū Sa'īd, 'Abdu 'l-Karīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Manṣūr at-Tamīmī as-Shãfi'ī (506/1113–562/1166), *al-Ansãb*, 5 vols., Dãru 'l-Jinãn, Beirut, 1408/1988.

ASH-SHAHRISTÃNĪ, Abu 'l-Fatḥ, Muḥammad ibn 'Abdi 'l-Karīm (d. 548/1153); *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal*, 2 vols., Cairo, 1948.

— *Nihãyatu 'l-iqdãm (fī 'ilmi 'l-kalãm)*, edited by A. Guillaume, Baghdad, al-Muthannã, (n.d.).

ASH-SHAWKÃNĪ, Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Yamãnī 1173/1760–1250/1834), *Fatḥu 'l-qadīr*, 5 vols., 'Ãlimu 'l-Kutub, Beirut, (n.d.).

Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam, The, Leiden ed., E.J.Brill, 1974.

AS-SUBKĪ, Tãju 'd-Dīn, Abū Naṣr, 'Abdu 'l-Wahhãb ibn 'Alī ibn 'Abdi 'l-Kãfī al-Miṣrī, ash-Shãfi'ī (727/1327–771/1370), *Ṭabaqãtu 'sh-Shãfi'iyyah al-Kubrã*, Cairo:'Īsã al-Ḥalabī, 1968.

AS-SUHAYLĪ, *arRawḍu 'l-unuf*, 7 vols., Cairo, n.d.

AS-SUYŪṬĪ, Jalãlu 'd-Dīn, 'Abdu 'r-Raḥmãn ibn Abī Bakr ibn Muḥammad ash-Shãfi'ī (849/1445–911/1505), *ad-Durru 'l-manthūr*, Beirut, n.d.

— *al-La'ãli al-maṣnu'ah*, (n.p.or d.)

— *Ṭabaqãtu 'l-ḥuffãẓ*, (n.p.or d.).
— *Tãrīkhu 'l-khulafã'*, Cairo, 1371/1952.

AṬ-ṬABARÃNĪ, Abu 'l-Qãsim, Sulaymãn ibn Aḥmad ibn Ayyūb al-Lakhmī (260/ 873–360/971), *as-Sunan*, (n.p.or d.).
— *al-Mu'jamu 'l-waṣīṭ*, 9 vols., Dãru 'l-Ḥaramayn, (n.p.or d.).
AṬ-ṬABARĪ, Abū Ja'far, Muḥammad ibn Jarīr ibn Rustam (224/839–310/932), *at-Tafsīr (Jãmi'u 'l-bayãn fī tafsīri 'l-Qur'ãn)*, Cairo, Būlãq ed., 1326 AH.
— *Tãrīkhu 'r-rusul wa 'l-mulūk,* edited by De Goeje, Lugd. Bat., 1901.
AṬ-ṬABRISĪ, Abū Manṣūr, Aḥmad ibn 'Alī (d. 620/1223), *al-Iḥtijãj*, edited by M. Bãqir al-Khirsãn, an-Najaf al-Ashraf, an-Nu'mãn Printing Press, 1966.
AT-TIRMIDHĪ, Abū 'Īsã, Muḥammad ibn 'Īsã as-Sulamī (209/824–279/892), *aṣ-Ṣaḥīh*, Cairo, 1292 AH.
AṬ-ṬŪSĪ, Abū Ja'far, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, (Shaykhu 'ṭ-Ṭãifah), *Fihrist Rijãli 'sh-Shī'ah*, edited by Baḥru '1-'Ulūm, an-Najaf al-Ashraf, 1381/1961.
— *at-Tibyãn (fī tafsīri 'l-Qur'ãn)*, 12 vols., Iran, 1376 AH.

AL-WÃQIDĪ, Abū 'Abdillãh, Muḥammad ibn 'Umar as-Sahmī al-Madanī (130/747 – 207/823), *al-Maghãzī*, (n.p.or d.).
WATT, W. Montgomery, *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought*, Edinburgh, 1973.

AL-YÃFI'Ī, *Mir'ãtu 'l-jinãn*, (n.p.or d.).
YÃQŪT AL-ḤAMAWĪ, *Mu'jamu '1-buldãn*, 5 vols., Beirut, 1957.
— *Mu'jamu 'l-udabã'*, (n.p.or d.).

AZ-ZABĪDĪ, *Tãju 'l-'arūs*, 10 vols., Egypt, n.d.
AZ-ZURQÃNĪ, 'Abdu 'l-Bãqī ibn Yūsuf ibn Aḥmad al-Mãlikī (1020/1611–1099/1688), *Sharḥu 'l-mawãhibi 'l-laddunniyyah*, 11 vols., Cairo, (n.d.).

* * * * *

INDEX

THE EMENDATION
of
A Shī‘ite Creed

THE EMENDATION
of
A Shī‘ite Creed

A translation of *Taṣḥīḥu 'l-I‘tiqãd*
of Abū ‘Abdillãh,
Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Nu‘mãn,
Known as ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd.
(336/948 or 338/950 – 413/1022)

By:

‘Irfãn ‘Abdu 'l-Ḥamīd

Volume II

WOFIS
World Organization for Islamic Services
Tehran – Iran.

Translated from the original Arabic
First edition 1426/2006

E-mail: wofis@wofis.com
http: //www.wofis.com

Annotated andPublished by:
World Organization for Islamic Services,
P.O.Box 11365-1545,
Tehran – 15837,
ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN.

In the Name of Allãh
The All-Compassionate, The All-Merciful

Praise belongs to Allãh, the Lord of all Being;
the All-Compassionate, the All-Merciful;
the Master of the Day of Judgement.
Thee only we serve; and to Thee alone we pray
for succour.
Guide us in the straight path,
the path of those whom Thou hast blessed,
not of those against whom Thou art wrathful,
nor of those who are astray.

*   *   *   *   *

O' Allãh! Send your blessings to the head of
your messengers and the last of
your prophets,
Muḥammad and his pure and cleansed progeny.
Also send your blessings to all your
prophets and envoys.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
الحمد لله رب العالمين الرحمن الرحيم
مالك يوم الدين إياك نعبد وإياك نستعين
اهدنا الصراط المستقيم صراط الذين
انعمت عليهم غير المغضوب عليهم
ولا الضالين

اللهم صل على
سيد رسلك وخاتم انبيائك
محمد وآله الطيبين الطاهرين
وصل على جميع الأنبياء والمرسلين

CONTENTS

* * * * *

TRANSLITERATION

Ar. Letters	Transliteration
ء	’
ا	a
ب	b
ت	t
ث	th
ج	j
ح	ḥ
خ	kh
د	d
ذ	dh
ر	r
ز	z
س	s
ش	sh
ص	ṣ
ض	ḍ
ط	ṭ
ظ	ẓ
ع	‘
غ	gh
ف	f

Ar. Letters	Transliteration
ق	q
ك	k
ل	l
م	m
ن	n
و	w
ه	h
ي	y
ة	ah

Short Vowel

ـَ	a
ـِ (or بِ)	i
ـُ	u

Long Vowels

آ	ã
يِ	ī
وُ	ū

PREFACE

The intellectual relationship between the Mu‘tazilite school of thought and Shī‘ism, which constitutes, as the late Prof. Macdonald noticed, "the great mystery of Muslim history", was referred to by many classical as well as modern scholars. The different opinions expressed by them on this complicated subject can be reduced to two theories.

Those who maintain that Shī‘ism has elaborated its theology on a basis borrowed from the intellectual system of the Mu‘tazilites, to which the Shī‘ah divines affiliated themselves during the fourth century of the Hijra. This theory seems to be very old in origin, since as early as the fourth century some, such as ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd, wrote a refutation of it. Among the Sunnite theologians ash-Shahrastãnī, lbn Taymiyyah and ad-Dawãnī supported it. Recently both Goldziher and Adam Mez have also championed it.

Contrary to this is the theory advanced by the Shī‘ite theo-

logians themselves who resented the whole aspersion of borrowing, and were engaged in intellectual controversies in an effort to repudiate it, directing their fiercest attacks against this so-called "false allegation". They were not content with this negative refutation but also alleged that the whole Mu‘tazilite system was itself a product of the teachings of the infallible Imãms, which were transfused into Mu‘tazilite philosophy through the tuition which the early Mu‘tazilite doctor, and the founder of the whole school, Wãṣil ibn ‘Aṭã’ received from Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah.* It is easy in this respect to explain and comprehend the concern of the Shī‘ah divines on the grounds that to them the whole structure of their authoritative system was based on and indeed derived from the direct intuition which the infallible received from God without any extraneous support.

Nevertheless, a critical investigation based on comparative research will soon disclose that the transformation of the Shī‘ite theology from a literal, traditional stand to a rational and allegorical interpretation of the revealed law, was primarily inspired by critical and rational Mu‘tazilite tendencies.

I am convinced that a critical comparison of the Imãmiyyah Creed as stated for the first time by Ibn Bãbawayh al-Qummī in his *‘Aqãidu 'l-Imãmiyyah*, with *Taṣḥīḥ I‘tiqãdãti 'l-Imãmiyyah* which was compiled by his pupil Abū ‘Abdillãh ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd, which is the core of my thesis, will demonstrate that the reconstruction, refinement and re-exam-

---

* This relationship, though referred to frequently (see Ibnu 'l-Murtaḍã, *al-Munyah*, p.5), is not admissible since Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah died in 79 or 80 AH, the very year in which Wãṣil was born. Some sources substitute Abū Hãshim ‘Abdullãh, the son of Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah for his father (ash-Shahristãnī, *al-Milal*, vol.1, p.57). Even, if this were so, the personal relationship should not be stressed too far, as it would be rash to assume their teachings are necessarily similar.

ination which is visible in al-Mufīd's work, marked a new orientation towards a critical methodology first inaugurated by the Mu‘tazilite. Hence it is essential that my work should be studied along with Prof. A.A.A. Fyzee's *A Shī‘ite Creed.*

My thesis, as it stands, consists of three parts. In Part One, I have dealt with the author, his works and the times in which he lived, since it is my opinion that the Buwayhid regime in which he lived, provided a milieu in which Mu‘tazilite teachings permeated Shī‘ite theology. I have prepared a complete list of his works, published, extant in manuscript, and unknown to us except by name, to show the position which he enjoyed and the important role he played in Shī‘ite thought. I was very lucky in my visit to an-Najaf, al-Kãẓimayn and Karbalã’, where I found many valuable manuscripts not recorded in the standard catalogues.

In Part Two I have prepared a critical translation of *Taṣḥīḥ I‘tiqãdãti 'l-Imãmiyyah,* with amendments and notes. I have based my translation on the published text which is based in turn on three different manuscripts. I have made use of a fourth copy which exists at the India Office Library under the number 2057. I have referred to them respectively by the letters (T) for the published text, and (N) for the India Office manuscript. In Part Three, I have commented on a selection of topics relevant to my thesis. In some cases detailed and somewhat lengthy explanations were unavoidable so that the different stands of the various schools should be made clear and their inter-relations and mutual impact easily discerned. Three general observations also are to be noticed:

a) I have restricted my research to the intellectual relationship between the Mu‘tazilite school of thought and the Ithna-‘Ashariyyah school of the Shī‘ah; thus wherever the word Shī‘ah is used generally, they are meant by it.
b) Since this thesis deals with controversial subjects and ter-

minology, it was very difficult to rely only on one of the approved translations of the Qur'ãn, consequently I have made use of all the standard translations.

c) Some of the terms which occur in the text or the commetary were too long to be explained in footnotes; I have separated them in Appendices which appear at the end of the work.

I take this opportunity to express my high esteem and deep gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. A. J. Arberry, whose encouragement and instruction was the source from which I drew my inspiration. My sincere thanks are also due to my friend, Miss. J. Thompson, of the Oriental Department, University Library, for her generous and unstinted assistance throughout the work in correcting my English. My gratitude is also due to Mrs. Virginia Barnes who bore the difficulty of typing the thesis. Lastly, I would like to express my thanks to the Iraqi Government for the scholarship which paved the way for my higher education.

'Irfãn 'Abdu 'l-Ḥamīd

April 1965,
Cambridge University.

PART ONE

A. THE AUTHOR AND HIS WORKS

B. A HISTORICAL SKETCH OF HIS TIMES

THE AUTHOR AND HIS WORKS

Abū ‘Abdillãh Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn an-Nu‘mãn al-Ḥãrithī al-‘Ukbarī al-Baghdãdī[1]. He was one of the most famous divines of the Ithnã-‘Ashariyyah School of the Shī‘ah and was unanimously regarded as one of their foremost scholars, while his works were considered to be among those which established the nascent theology of the Shī‘ah on a sound and clear-cut basis. Abū ‘Abdillãh traced his descent back to Qaḥṭãn, so was proud of his purely Arab ancestory. He is well-known to us under two different *laqab*s, al-Mufīd and Ibnu 'l-Mu‘allim. The former *laqab* was bestowed on him, according to some authorities, by his master ‘Alī ibn ‘Īsã ar-Rummãnī[2] with whom al-Mufīd "discussed the Imãmate and displayed a powerful intelligence; therefore he called him by this *laqab*".[3] Others mentioned the assertion that the Twelfth Imãm (*Ṣãḥibu 'z-Zamãn*), 'The Master of the Time', "appointed him as his deputy and bestowed upon him this honorific title"[4]. His second title, Ibnu 'l-Mu‘allim, seems to have been derived from his "father's occupation as a teacher in the city of Wãṣiṭ"[5].

al-Mufīd was born in a small village in the district of ‘Ukbarã, known as Suwayqat ibn al-Baṣrī, in 11th Dhi 'l-Qi‘dah, 336/947 – according to an-Najãshī[6] and al-Khwãnsãrī[7] – or in 388, according to aṭ-Ṭūsī[8] and Ibn Shahrãshūb[9], and died on the third (or second) of Ramaḍãn 413 AH/December 1022 AD,

at al-Karkh and was buried first in his house-yard in the suburb of al-Ushnãn[10]. Afterwards his body was transferred to the cemetery of Quraysh.

Historians described the day of his death as a day of universal lamentation; "both his friends and enemies were full of mourning"[11]. He was so highly esteemed that "eighty thousand people are said to have gathered in the public square in Baghdad at the time of his funeral"[12]. Among those who wrote elegies on him was his pupil, ash-Sharīf ar-Raḍī.

Historians, whether from the Sunnite ranks or from those of the Shī‘ah are unanimously of the opinion that al-Mufīd was one of the most brilliant scholars of his day and destined to play a constructive and decisive role in the intellectual and political affairs of the Buwayhid regime. Both his friends and opponents recognized his outstanding ability and contribution to knowledge.

al-Mufīd was famous for his learning and integrity, as well as his powers of memory and reasoning. Ibnu 'n-Nadīm says, "in our time Abū ‘Abdillãh was the head of the Shī‘ah theologians, outstanding in the art of dialectics in the school he followed, of a penetrating wit and retentive memory. I met him and found him excelled"[13]. aṣ-Ṣafadī characterized him as "the unrivalled master of the known sciences of that time"[14]. Ibn Ḥajar described him as, "an author of many outstanding works numbering about two hundred"[15]. Ibn Kathīr described him as "the head of the Rawãfiḍ and the man who wrote many works which defended and consolidated their doctrines"[16].

The Shī‘ah biographers also esteemed him highly and recognized the great influence he had on later theologians and traditionists. al-Khwãnsãrī observed that "he was the most honoured teacher and the spiritual head of all the Shī‘ahs, and he who followed him benefited by his knowledge; his profound comprehension of jurisprudence, scholastic theology, and the

science of transmission (*riwãyah*) was famed far and wide."[17] He is numbered in *A'yãnu 'sh-Shī'ah* among "the chief Shī'ah theologians", and described as the "foremost *faqīh* and doctor of his time, whom the Shī'ahs regarded as the master of theology, principles of jurisprudence, tradition, biography and exegesis of the Qur'ãn"[18]. al-Mufīd, in an endeavour to consolidate Shī'ite thought and give it an integral shape, compiled two books, the first concerning the principles of belief, called *Awãilu 'l-maqãlãt*, and the other concerning the principles of the practical law, called *al-I'lãm.* These became a basis for Shī'ah learning and their effect was far-reaching.

The high position of al-Mufīd can be appreciated by the fact that "the Buwayhid *amīr*, al-Mu'taḍid, used to visit him at his house and attend the discussions held at his behest"[19]. According to the assertion of many authorities, al-Mufīd was in contact with the Master of the Time and he bestowed upon him his favour and addressed him as his deputy. One of his charges runs like this, "Peace be unto thee, O our sincere disciple, in whom we have complete trust . . . may God perpetuate His guidance to you in your championing of the truth and may He reward you highly for preaching the truth on our behalf"[20].

al-Mufīd, at an early age, acquired his knowledge from more than sixty masters – *shaykh*s; among them was the celebrated divine, Ibn Bãbawayh al-Qummī (d. 381 AH) and the illustrious traditionist, Abu 'l-Qãsim Ja'far ibn Muḥammad, Ibn Qūlawayh al-Qummī (d. 368 AH)[21], and the famous theologian, Abū 'Alī Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn al-Junayd al-Iskãfī (d. 381)[22]. Among the prominent Shī'ah scholars who received their education from al-Mufīd were ash-Sharīf ar-Raḍī (Abu 'l-Ḥasan Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Mūsawī, d. 406)[23], ash-Sharīf al-Murtaḍã ('Alamu 'l-Hudã Abu 'l-Qãsim 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, d. 436)[24] and aṭ-Ṭūsī (Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, d. 458)[25].

al-Mufīd represents a new, rational trend within Shī‘ah thought, the result of which was the rejection of literal acceptance of the divine law and the introduction of rational and allegorical interpretation into Imãmiyyah teaching for the first time, in an attempt to eradicate the fallacies and absurdities resulting from literal acceptance. This new method, though it had supporters, was not approved by his successors without a great deal of reluctance and criticism; some, such as ‘Izzu 'd-Dīn al-Ḥasan ibn Sulaymãn al-Ḥillī, writing refutation of the 'innovations' he introduced [26].

With regard to the works of al-Mufīd, our sources ascribe to him two hundred books. This large number may be due to the fact that some of the titles mentioned, in a large number of cases, could be chapters, abstracts, responsa, or even summaries of a book, rather than complete works. It is also possible that in some instances the same book may have been known under two or more different titles.*

* A full list of his works will be given later.

A HISTORICAL SKETCH OF HIS TIMES

The period in which al-Mufīd lived has a special importance not only from the point of view of Shī‘ite theology, but also in the history of scholastic theology in general. It was a period of dogmatic controversies and sectarian disputes, each school trying to reshuffle and re-examine its teachings. It was a period when the most eminent theologians of Islam lived and exercised their influence, such as al-Bãqillãnī (an Ash‘arite), al-Qãḍī ‘Abdu '1-Jabbãr (a Mu‘tazilite) and al-Mufīd, the Shī‘ite. Thus it is necessary to give a brief sketch of the Buwayhid regime (334-447 AH) in which al-Mufīd played a remarkable role, and which was roughly coterminous with his lifetime.

The Buwayhids entered Baghdad on Jumãdu 'l-Awwal, 344/ 17th January, 946, with an army mainly composed of foreign elements under the leadership of Aḥmad ibn Buwayh. The success of this entry was due partly to a secret correspondence with the Caliph al-Mustakfī (d. 338/949), "who received the victorious leader and bestowed upon him the honorific title of Mu‘izzu 'd-Dawlah and installed him as Amīru '1-Umarã’. At the same time, his brothers ‘Alī and al-Ḥasan received the titles of ‘Imãdu '1-Dawlah and Ruknu 'd-Dawlah, respectively. Moreover, he ordered their names and titles to be struck on the coinage"[27].

The advent of the Buwayhids to Baghdad brought about an essential and profound change in the Caliphate. It is true that the seizure of power by the Buwayhids did little more than set the seal on the development which had, in effect, placed the caliphate under the domination of army chiefs, promoted Amīru '1-Umarã’. "But this time there was the added fact that the Buwayhids were professing Shī‘ahs, so much so that it might have been asked whether they were not about to suppress a caliphate whose legitimacy had no special meaning for

them"[28]. No sooner had they entered Baghdad than they displayed their disrespect toward the Caliphate, so twelve days after, Mu‘izzu 'd-Dawlah dismissed the Caliph on "the ground that he was plotting with his officers against him, and seeking help from the Ḥamdãnids of al-Mawṣil; moreover, he was annoyed by the Caliph who put the head of the Shī‘ah into prison"[29]. The dismissal of the Caliph "took place in an unceremonious manner"[30].

From the dogmatic point of view, the Buwayhids "were imbued with Shī‘ism; they preached it energetically; and Shī‘ism was substantially strengthened by their effort"[31]. Being the adherents of a political system based on and derived from a divinely appointed Imãmate "they did not recognize the claim of the Sunnī caliph to supreme headship of the Islamic world"[32], and consequently they "rejected altogether the ‘Abbãsid's right to caliphate, because they were convinced that they had usurped the office from its true holders, and so the religious impulse which might have incited them to obey the ‘Abbãsid Caliphate was absent"[33]. It was essential doctrine which obliged them to accept the divinely appointed Imãm as the only justified temporal and spiritual leader of Islam. As a matter of fact, they maintained the ‘Abbãsid Caliphate for purely political reasons, since the abolition of it might have resulted in a colossal revolt against Buwayhid authority, which they were anxious to avoid[34]. Yet this doctrinal divergency in the conception of political authority was responsible for a series of humiliations to the Sunnī caliph. Thus the Buwayhid *amīr*s were "the first princes who insisted on having their names mentioned in the *khuṭbah* along with that of the Caliph"[35]. This was followed by a series of further encroachments on the prerogatives of the Caliph. They began to impose restrictions on the political power of the caliphs; the confiscation of their lands and properties, and the dismissal of whomsoever they desired by cauterizing their eyes

with hot iron, and thereby disqualifying them from ruling. It is curious to mention that on one occasion "‘Aḍudu 'd-Dawlah commanded that the Caliph's name should be abolished from the Friday *khuṭbah* so that no prayer was said for the Caliph for two months, because of a slight dispute which took place between ‘Aḍudu 'd-Dawlah and the Caliph"[36].

It is a historical fact that with the beginning of the Buwayhid regime, the caliphate as a body-politic began to lose its importance, and the caliphs gradually, but constantly, lost all their political powers. What remained to them was, as al-Bīrūnī observed, "only a religious, doctrinal authority and not a secular power, exactly like that of the head of the Jãlūt (Diaspora) among the Jews, who have only the religious leadership without any temporal powers"[37].

Beside what has been mentioned, the most important feature of this period, which has its relative importance in our present study, was that it witnessed a severe struggle between the two dominant doctrines, the Sunnīte and the Shī‘ite, each trying to impose its religious sovereignty all over the Muslim world. The ‘Abbãsid Caliph, after being deprived of all his effective political powers, was anxious to restore his religious supremacy among the people. The result of this trend was the emergence of a semi-religious party, mainly composed of the *‘ulamã’*, *fuqahã’,* and the *khuṭabã’.* This semi-religious party proved to be of a special importance to the ever-weakened caliph. Thus, although the Buwayhid *amīr*s were the real independent governors of the empire, yet it was very dangerous for them to display openly their enmity towards the caliphs. As Prof. Arnold observed, "the inflictions of such humiliation on the caliph is in striking contrast with the honour and reverence paid to him, whenever it was politic to bring him forward, as the supreme head of the faith"[38]. This religious party was to play a decisive role especially during the period of Buwayhid

decline and was used as a weapon by which the Caliph began to impose his will on the Buwayhid *amīr*s. For example, when the Caliph al-Qãim (422-467/1031-1075) rebuked Jalãlu 'd-Dawlah (416-435) for not punishing his slave for entering an orchard of the Caliph, "he asked the judges not to deliver judgement, the jurists to refrain from delivering response and the preachers to refrain from their duties, which forced the Buwayhid *amīr* to petition the Caliph"[39]. Meanwhile, the Caliph laid emphasis on his religious duties, as a means of fortifying his prerogative against the unscrupulous behaviour of the Buwayhids, which was constantly increasing. We may note in particular, as an event without previous parallel, that the Caliph, al-Qãim, wrote a theological work in the orthodox Sunnī strain which was read out every Friday in the circle of the traditionists in the mosque of al-Mahdī "[40].

As a counter-balance to this Sunnī party, the Buwayhids for their part began to depend largely on the Shī'ah. It is said that Mu'izzu 'd-Dawlah intended from the very beginning to abolish the 'Abbãsid Caliphate and to transfer it to Abu 'l-Ḥasan Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyã az-Zaydī[41]. He was deterred from carrying out this scheme by his *wazīr* (vizier), who told him, "today you are faced with a caliph whom you and your followers believe has no right to the caliphate; thus if you command them they will kill him and consider themselves innocent of his blood, whereas if you replace him by an 'Alid Caliph, whom you and your followers believe to be the rightful caliph, then if he commands them to kill you, they will perform his command"[42].

From this, it would appear that the Buwayhids maintained the caliphate "purely for political reasons" because they were aware that "had they destroyed the caliphate in Baghdad, the institution would have reappeared elsewhere"[43]. The caliphate for them, then, was a means to legalize their authority over the

Sunnites in their state, and to strengthen their diplomatic relations with the world outside by the weight of the moral authority and respect which the Sunnite caliph still enjoyed.

Thus it is obvious that the Buwayhid period was the scene of a severe struggle between two divergent political powers, and echoing this, of two doctrinal schools within the Muslim community. As for the importance of this period in the founding and developing of Shīʻite theology, it can be demonstrated in two points:

First: With the beginning of the Buwayhid regime, a severe dogmatic struggle arose between the two dominant doctrines, the Shīʻites and the Sunnītes. "It is certain that the Buwayhids welcomed somewhat indiscriminately the Shīʻīs or Muʻtazilīs of different shades of opinion, but politically they were Twelvers"[44]. This sectarian struggle culminated in 351 AH, when Muʻizzu 'd-Dawlah caused Shīʻite curses to be inscribed on the walls of the mosques which run thus; "May God curse Muʻãwiyah ibn Abī Sufyãn, and him who prevented al-Ḥasan's body from being buried behind the grave of his grandfather, and him who exiled Abū Dharr, and him who expelled al-ʻAbbãs from the *shūrã* (electoral council)"[45]. These curses were publicly displayed while the Caliph was unable to forbid them.

This dogmatic rift deepened still further when Muʻizzu 'd-Dawlah introduced, "influenced perhaps by Daylamite practices"[46], the commemorating of the martyrdom of al-Ḥusayn. On the 10th of Muḥarram, *ʻÃshūrã* day, the chief festival of the Shīʻah, the bazaars were closed, the butchers suspended business, the cooks ceased cooking, the cisterns were emptied of their contents, pitchers were placed with felt covering the streets, women walked about with fallen tresses, blackened faces, torn dresses, striking their faces and wailing for al-Ḥusayn. In the same year, on the 18th Dhu 'l-Ḥijjah, the celebration of the day

of the "pond of Khumm", the day on which the Prophet is said to have nominated ‘Alī as his successor, was officially inaugurated at Baghdad, fires were lit, drums were beaten, horns blown, and people hastened from the early morning to the cemetery of Quraysh"[47].

These foreign and newly imported practices gave rise to bitter sectarian hatreds, and were responsible for sporadic civil wars. "In 388, a destructive conflict broke out between the two sects and consequently al-Karkh district was plundered"[48]. In 346 AH a similar civil disturbance occurred between "the Shī‘ite section of al-Karkh and the Sunnites because of *as-sabb*[*], which resulted in a heavy massacre"[49]. These civil conflicts took place continually in the year 348-351,353, 393-398 and 409.

This was the characteristic feature of the period; what, then, was the attitude of al-Mufīd towards current events? al-Mufīd as the "head of the Shī‘ah and the teacher of the Rawãfiḍ"[50] was destined to play an active role in defending the dogma of the Ithnã-‘Ashariyyah school of the Shī‘ah. Due to "his high ranking position at the courts of the Buwayhids and the princes of dynasties"[51], he enjoyed spiritual supremacy and considerable influence over the affairs of that time. Thus, it was during the Buwayhid period and because of their energetic support, says al-Maqrīzī, "that the teachings of the Rawãfiḍ spread widely in North Africa, Syria, Diyãr Bakr, Kūfah, Baṣrah, Baghdãd, all ‘Irãq, Khurãsãn, Transoxiana, Ḥijãz, Yaman and Baḥrayn"[52]. As a result of this tremendous expansion of Shī‘ism, there were ceaseless disturbances and dissensions between the Shī‘ites and the Sunnites. In 393 AH, widespread disturbances occurred and the trouble-makers spread all over the country, a thing which caused Bahãu 'd-Dawlah (989-1012 AD) to send the leader of the army to deal with the situation. He reached Baghdad, suppressed by force the agitators and prevented both

* Denouncing certain companions of the Holy Prophet (of Islam).

the Sunnites and the Shīʻites from demonstrating their doctrines and expelled Ibnu 'l-Muʻallim, the Shaykh of the lmãmiyyah. Thus the city regained its tranquillity[53].

Second: The second reason for the importance of the Buwayhids in the development of Shīʻah theology, is that they provided a meeting point where Shīʻah theology was influenced by the rational methods of the Muʻtazilah. This dogmatic and intellectual relationship which, in the words of Prof. Macdonald, is "the great mystery of Muslim History"[54], has still not received full attention, and can only be made clear by comparative research based on a profound historical study of the Buwayhid period from the dogmatic point of view.

At the end of the third century of the Hijrah, Muʻtazilism was suffering a severe decline in political influence, which began early with the accession of al-Mutawakkil to the caliphate (232/847). This political decline was coupled at the beginning of the fourth century with a decisive triumph of Ashʻarism which "evolved a new orthodox scholasticism and defeated the Muʻtazilites on their own ground"[55]. In this perilous situation, the Muʻtazilah might have been induced by the instinct of self-preservation to conclude a political alliance with Shīʻism, then the official and politically influential doctrine of the state. One of the reasons which facilitated this compromise was that "the vagueness of Rãfiḍites had been replaced by the much more definite lmãmite form of Shīʻism"[56]. It is curious that the very Muʻtazilism of which "the refutation and rejection of the extremely heterogenous elements of Rãfiḍites was the centre of its invaluable service to the cause of Islam"[57], was now trying to come to some sort of agreement with it. Here we have also to bear in mind that the "suggestion has been made that Muʻtazilism was essentially an attempt to work out a compromise that would in part overcome the cleavage between Sunnites and Shīʻites"[58].

At any rate, Shī‘ism and Mu‘tazilism, as adh-Dhahabī says, "established from about 370 AH a friendly and brotherly relationship with each other"[59]. al-Maqdisī was fully aware of this inter-relation; he states that "the majority of the Shī‘ah in Persia were Mu‘tazilite, and that the Buwayhid, ‘Aḍudu 'd-Dawlah adopted it"[60]. This dogmatic inter-relation is affirmed by both Adam Mez and Goldziher, who say that "theologically the Shī‘ahs are the heirs of the Mu‘tazilah", and that "in the fourth century there was actually no real system of Shī‘ite theology; henceforth the Shī‘ite *amīr*, ‘Aḍudu 'd-Dawlah, merely adapted himself to the view of the Mu‘tazilite"[61].

This attachment of Mu‘tazilism to the ruling power was of special importance, which is confirmed by al-Maqrīzī, who says that "Mu‘tazilism spread considerably under the Buwayhids regime in Iraq, Khurãsãn and Transoxiana"[62].

I am inclined to suggest that the period in which aṣ-Ṣãḥib ibn ‘Abbãd (326-385/939-995) governed the empire independently during the emirate of Fakhru 'd-Dawlah al-Buwayhī and which lasted eighteen years (367-385/977-995) is the period within which Shī‘ism adopted the rational system of Mu‘tazilism.

Abu 'l-Qãsim Ismã‘īl ibn ‘Abbãd aṣ-Ṣãḥib is known as an "illustrious Mu‘tazilite who inherited his ideas from his father who wrote a book on the ordinances of the Qur’ãn, *Aḥkãmu 'l-Qur’ãn,* in which he supported Mu‘tazilism"[63]. In his formative years, aṣ-Ṣãḥib was greatly influenced by and imbued with their dogmas till he came to be known "as one of their foremost masters"[64]. When he was *wazīr*, he used his office as a means to support whole-heartedly the Mu‘tazilite teachings so "people began to follow the doctrine he professed, and copy his words, desiring reward from him"[65]. aṣ-Ṣãḥib has also been mentioned among the Shī‘ah divines and was accused of Shī‘ite tendencies. Ibn Ḥajar says "that he added to the innovation of

the Mu‘tazilah the heterodoxy of the Shī‘ah"[66].

This intellectual influence of Mu‘tazilism on Shī‘ism which is confirmed by ash-Shahrastãnī[67], Ibn Taymiyyah[68] and ad-Dawãnī[69] was emphatically rejected by the Shī‘ah. They were, and still are, anxious to deny this impact on their dogmas, which are supposed to be the fruits of the direct teachings of the divinely-inspired Imãms. al-Mufīd himself rejected this charge, which seems to be very old, and denied that the Shī‘ah were influenced by and borrowed from the Mu‘tazilah[70]. But a critical and comparative study of his book, *Taṣḥīḥ I‘tiqãdãti 'l-Imãmiyyah* with that of his master, Ibn Bãbawayh al-Qummī, which is the purpose of this thesis, establishes the fact that the shifting of Shī‘ah theology from an authoritarian stand, represented by Ibn Bãbawayh, to a rational interpretation cultivated first by al-Mufīd, was a direct result of this Mu‘tazilite impact which is specifically denied by him. It is worth observing that the "Mu‘tazilite influence has maintained its hold on the Shī‘itic literature up to the present time. It is a serious error to assert that after the decisive victory of the Ash‘arite theology, the Mu‘tazilite teachings ceased to play any active part in religion or literature. The rich dogmatic literature of the Shī‘ah extending into our own days refutes such an assertion"[71].

* * * * *

NOTES

PART ONE

[1] ‘Ukbarī, ‘Ukbarãwī: his *nisbah* (relationship) is derived from a small town, ‘Ukbar, near ad-Dujayl, about ten *farsakh*s distance from Baghdad. The name seems not to be Arabic. See Yãqūt, *Mu‘jamu 'l-buldãn*, vo1.5, p.203.

[2] Abu '1-Ḥasan, ‘Alī ibn ‘Īsã ar-Rummãnī al-Ikhshīdī al-Warrãq, one of the most illustrious doctors of the Mu‘tazilah of the tenth class, well known as an exegetist, philologist and theologian. He was called ‘Alī al-Jãmi‘ because of his profound and comprehensive knowledge of *Fiqh,* Qur’ãn, *Naḥw* and *Kalãm*. aṣ-Ṣãḥib ibn ‘Abbãd, on being questioned if he, too, had written a commentary on the Qur’ãn, replied ‘Alī ibn ‘Īsã had left nothing for him to do. He has also been accused of Shī‘ite tendencies. See Ibnu 'l-Murtaḍã, *al-Munyah wa 'l-amal*, p.65. Yãqūt, *Mu‘jamu 'l-udabã’*, vo1.14, p.73; as-Suyūṭī, *Tabaqãtu 'l-mufassirīn*, p.24.

[3] al-Majlisī, *Biḥãru 'l-anwãr*, the introduction to the new edition by ash-Shīrãzī, vo1.1 , p.71.

[4] Ibn Shahrãshūb, *Ma‘ãlimu 'l-‘ulamã’*, p.101.

[5] al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdãdī, *Tãrīkh Baghdãd*, vo1.3, p.231.

[6] an-Najãshī, *ar-Rijãl*, p.286.

[7] al-Khwãnsãrī, *Rawḍãtu 'l-jannãt*, p.563.

[8] aṭ-Ṭūsī, *Rijãlu 'sh-Shī‘ah*, p.186.

[9] Ibn Shahrãshūb, op. cit., p.101. Cf., Borckelmann, C., GAL, Supp.1, p.322. Also, *E.I.*, the article, "al-Mufīd", vo1.3, ii, p.625.

[10] al-Ushnãn, an old suburb of Baghdad, see *Mu‘jamu 'l-buldãn*, vol.l, p.262.

[11] aṭ-Ṭūsī, *ar-Rijãl*, p.187.

[12] Donaldson, D.M., *The Shī‘ite Religion*, p.287.

[13] Ibnu 'n-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p.178.

[14] aṣ-Ṣafadī, *al-Wãfī bi 'l-wafayãt*, vo1.5, p.l 16.

[15] Ibn Ḥajar, *Lisãnu 'l-mīzãn*, vo1.5, p.368.

[16] Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidãyah*, vo1.12, p.15.
[17] al-Khwãnsãrī, *Rawḍãtu 'l-jannãt*, op. cit, p.563.
[18] Muḥsin al-Amīn, al-‘Ãmilī, *A‘yãnu 'sh-Shī‘ah*, vol.l, pt.2, p.106.
[19] Ibn Ḥajar, op. cit., vo1.5, p.368.
[20] al-Majlisī, *Biḥãru 'l-anwãr,* the introduction to the new edition by ash-Shīrãzī, vol. 1, p.71.
[21] For his life, see: an-Najãshī, op. cit., p.89; Ibn Ḥajar, op. cit., vo1.2, p.125; Ibn Shahrãshūb, op. cit., p.26.
[22] For his life, see: Ibnu 'n-Nadīm, op. cit., p.196.
[23] For his life, see: Ibn Khallikãn, *Wafayãtu 'l-a'yãn*, vol.2, p.2; an-Najãshī, op. cit., p.283; Ibn Ḥajar, op. cit., vo1.5, p.141.
[24] For his life, see: Ibnu '1-Murtaḍã, op. cit., p.19; an-Najãshī, op. cit., p.192; Ibn Ḥajar, op. cit., vo1.4, p.223.
[25] For his life, see: Ibn Ḥajar, op. cit., vo1.5, p.135. Also Ibn Shahrãshūb, op. cit., p.102.
[26] The refutation is called *al-Muḥtaḍir*, published in an-Najaf al-Ashraf (Iraq) in 1370/1951. See: ash-Shaykh ‘Abdullãh, *Falãsifatu 'sh-Shī‘ah*, pp.454-66.
[27] Ibnu 'l-Athīr, *al-Kãmil*, vo1.8, p.337, Ḥasan Ibrãhīm Ḥasan, *Tãrīkhu 'l-Islãmi 's-siyãsī*, vo1.3, p.43.
[28] *E.I.*, the article, "Buwayhids", by Cl. Cahen, vol.1, ii, p.1350.
[29] ad-Dūrī, ‘Abdu '1-‘Azīz, *Dirãsat fi 'l-‘uṣūri 'l-‘Abbãsiyyah al-muta'akhkhirah*, p.249.
[30] *Ibid.*, p.249. See also: Arnold, T., *The Caliphate*, p.61; al-Khuḍarī, *Muḥãḍarãt fī tãrīkhi 'l-umami 'l-Islãmiyyah*, vo1.2, p.380.
[31] al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, vo1.2, p.308.
[32] Arnold, T., op. cit., p.61.
[33] Ibnu '1-Athīr, op. cit., vo1.8, p.339.
[34] ad-Dūrī, op. cit., p.248. See p.1 l.
[35] Arnold, T., op. cit., p.61.
[36] Ibnu '1-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓim*, vo1.7. p.75.
[37] Quoted from ad-Dūrī, op. cit., p.255.
[38] Arnold, T., op. cit., p.65.
[39] Ibnu '1-Jawzī, op. cit., vol.8, p.82.
[40] *Ibid.*, vo1.8, p.109. Also, Mez, Adam, *The Renaissance of Islam*, Eng. transl. by Khudã Bukhsh and Margoliouth, p.61.
[41] ad-Dūrī, op. cit., p.248.
[42] Ibnu '1-Athīr, op. cit., vol.8, p.339; Cf., ad-Dūrī, op. cit., p.248.
[43] *Ibid.*; al-Khuḍarī, op. cit., vol.2., p.378.

[44] *E.I,* the article, "Buwayhids", by Cl. Cahen, vol.l, ii, p.1352.

[45] as-Suyūṭī, *Tãrīkhu 'l-khulafã'*, p.266; Ibn Khaldūn, *at-Tãrīkh*, vol.4, p.886; Cf., Mez, Adam, op. cit., p.68.

[46] *E.I*, the article, "Buwayhids", vol.l, ii, p.1352.

[47] Ibnu '1-Jawzī, op. cit., vol.7, p.10; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidãyah*, vol.11, p.243. Also, Mez, Adam, op. cit., p.69.

[48] Ibn Kathīr, op. cit., vol.ll, p.221.

[49] *Ibid.*, p.232.

[50] Ibn Taghrī Birdī, *an-Nujūmu 'z-zãhirah*, vol.4, p.258; aṣ-Ṣafadī, op. cit., vol.5, p.116.

[51] Ibn Taghrī Birdī, op. cit., vol.4, p.258.

[52] al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, vol.2, p.308.

[53] Ibnu '1-Athīr, op. cit., vol.9, p.126.

[54] Quoted from Holister, J.N., *The Shī'a of India*, p.26.

[55] Gibb, H.A.R., *Mohammadanism*, p.116.

[56] Watt, W.M., *Islamic Philosophy and Theology*, p.83.

[57] Nyberg, H.S., his intro. to his ed. of *Kitãbu 'l-Intiṣãr*, p.24. Zuhdī Ḥasan Jãrullãh

[58] Watt, W.M., op. cit., p.83.

[59] adh-Dhahabī, *Mīzãnu 'l-i'tidãl*, vol.2, p.230; (Quoted from, *al-Mu'tazilah*, p.207).

[60] al-Maqdisī, *Aḥsanu 't-taqãsīm,* p.439.

[61] Mez, Adam, op. cit., p.62; Cf. Goldziher, L, *Vorlesungen über den Islam,* the Arabic translation, p.224.

[62] al-Maqrīzī, op. cit., vo1.2, p.358.

[63] Yãqūt, *Mu'jamu 'l-udabã'*, vol.6, p.127.

[64] Ibn Ḥajar, *Lisãnu 'l-mīzãn*, vol.1, p.413.

[65] Yãqūt, op. cit., vol.6, p.225.

[66] Ibn Ḥajar, op. cit., p.413.

[67] ash-Shahristãnī, *al-Milal*, vol.1, p.209. Also, p.224.

[68] Ibn Taymiyyah, *ar-Rasãil*, vol.3, p.115.

[69] ad-Dawãnī, Jalãlu 'd-Dīn, *Sharḥu 'l-'aqãidi 'l-'Aḍūdiyyah*, (quoted from *Muḥammad 'Abduh bayna 'l-falãsifah wa 'l-mutakallimīn*, edited by Sulaymãn Dunyã, p.26).

[70] al-Mufīd, *Ajwibatu 'l-masãili 's-saghãniyyah*, MS. No.442, an-Najaf al-Ashraf, (Iraq), Maktabat Muḥsin al-Ḥakīm, fol. 14.

[71] Goldziher, I., op. cit., p.222.

* * * * *

PART TWO

In the Name of Allãh,
the Merciful, the Compassionate

Praise be to Allãh for His bounties, and peace be upon Muḥammad and his family. This is the emendation of *A Shī‘ite Creed* of Abū Ja‘far Ibn Bãbawayh, may Allãh have mercy upon him, compiled by ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd Abū ‘Abdillãh Muḥammad ibn an-Nu‘mãn*, may Allãh have mercy upon him.

---

* N reads *Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad*, which is correct.

1. THE METAPHORICAL INTERPRETATION OF THE BARING OF THE SHANK (*KASHFU 'S-SÃQ*)

The learned divine, Abū Ja'far *Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn Ibn Bãbawayh al-Qummī, died in 381 AH[1], says, in the treaties of his (Shī'ite) creed, on the meaning of His, the Exalted's Speech: *On a day when a shank* (sãq) *shall be bared, and they shall be summoned to prostrate themselves, but they cannot* [68:42]. *as-Sãq* (shank) here means the result, or consummation of the affair and its intensity.

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd says: The meaning of the verse quoted above is intended for the Day of Resurrection on which an important, hard and intense matter will be disclosed, and that will be the reckoning and scrutinizing of (man's) actions; the recompensing for (good or bad) deeds, and the divulging of the heart secrets; the revealing of mysteries, and the appraisal of good and bad acts. Hence, He (Allãh) designates by *as-sãq* the gravity of the matter; and by the same reasoning, the Arabs used to symbolize the violence and severity of war with their peculiar expression, "The war broke out [amongst us] (*qãmati 'l-ḥarbu [binã] 'alã sãq*)"[2]. And their poet, Sa'd ibn Khãlid, says:

The war disclosed all its severety,
and revealed its full calamity.
The eagle of death appeared,
bearing in its train the decreed fate.

Also, like this is their expression, "The fair is set up", (*qad qãmati 's-sūq*), denoting when the people crowd together, and buying and selling goes briskly with much effort and exertion.

2. THE METAPHORICAL INTERPRETATION OF "THE HAND (*AL-YAD*)"

Abū Ja'far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, similarly explains "hand" in the sense of strength, and adduces, to support his view, the verse: *And remember Our servant David, possessed of strength* (ayd) [38:17]. And he says: *dha 'l-ayd*, means possessed of strength (*quwwah*).

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd says: The word *yad* has another interpretation which denotes grace. The poet says:

He has bestowed favours on me which I do not deny;
for indeed denial of favours is but ingratitude.

So, it is possible that the saying of Allãh, the Exalted, *Dãwūda dha 'l-ayd*, means Dãwūd (David), a bountiful man. Similar, also, is the saying of Allãh: *Nay, but both His hands are outspread* [5:64]. Here, by "The two hands", are meant the two favours of this life and the life hereafter.

3. THE BREATHING OF THE SPIRIT (INTO MAN) (*NAFKHU 'L -ARWÃḤ*)

Abū Ja'far says, concerning the Spirit in the Speech of Allãh, the Exalted: *And I breathed into it of My Spirit* [15:29], that it is, in this context, a created Spirit (*rūḥ*). He attributes it to Himself in the same way as He attributes the House (Ka'bah) to Himself, although it is created by Him.

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd says: The reason for attributing the Spirit or the House to Himself is not merely that they were

created by Him; but, also, that they have been distinguished by His greatness and glory, and endued with His awfulness. This indicates that this Spirit and this House are favoured with His sublimity and glory, which have not been granted to any other spirit or house save them, thus to draw the attention of creation – by this means – to believe in and exalt them.

4. METONYM AND METAPHOR (IN THE QUR'ĀN)

Abū Ja'far, may Allāh have mercy upon him, has said, concerning the interpretation of the Speech of Allāh, the Exalted: (O Iblīs!) *What prevented thee from prostrating thyself before that I created with My two hands* (yadayy)*?* [38:75]. (By 'two hands'), He means 'My strength and My power (*qudratī wa quwwatī*).'

Abū 'Abdillāh (al-Mufīd) says: This is not correct[3], since it involves repetition in meaning and implies that Allāh says: 'By My strength, by My strength', or 'By My power, by My power', because literally 'strength' is equivalent to 'power', and vice versa, and there is no meaning in such a statement. The correct explanation is that advanced above concerning grace (*luṭf*); consequently, the verse signifies, 'Allāh's double grace in this world and the world hereafter'. In the same way, the *ba* in Allāh's saying (*bi yadayya*), 'with My two hands', stands for (*lām*), as if Allāh has said: "(*Khalaqtu liyadayya*), I have created for My hands", meaning by this, 'for My double grace', as He has said: *And I have not created jinn and mankind except to worship Me* [51:56], since worship is a gift from Allāh, and His grace upon them, for it leads them to His perpetual grace. A probable meaning of 'both My hands', is the double meaning of power and grace as though the Almighty said, "created with My own power and grace". Another explanation is that the

attribution of the 'hands' to Allãh was intended to stress the overwhelming power of Allãh, and the act was accomplished by His sole will, irrespective of His strength or grace or anything else. This interpretation is supported by the verse: *That is for what thy hands have forwarded* [22:10], and it means 'what you have forwarded of your deeds'; and also by Allãh's saying: *Whatever misfortune may visit you is for what your own hands have earned* [42:30], which signifies 'what you have acquired'. The Arabs often used the proverb: "Thy hand hath tied, and thy mouth hath blown into it" (*yadãka awkatã wa fūka nafakh*)[4], in the sense that it was your doing and you carried it out and performed it though you did not use your actual hands (limbs) in it.

5. THE ATTRIBUTION OF SCHEMING: BEGUILING AND MOCKERY TO ALLÃH

Abū Ja‘far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, maintained that the meaning of Allãh's saying: (The hypocrites) *seek to beguile Allãh, but it is He Who beguileth them* [4:142], and: *They have forgotten Allãh, so He hath forgotten them* [9:67], and: *And they devised, and Allãh devised, and Allãh is the best of devisers* [3:54], and: *Allãh shall mock them* [2:15], is that Allãh will requite them for their base acts[5].

Abū ‘Abdillãh concurs, and adds that the interpretation advanced by Abū Ja‘far is sound, but he has not supplied the reason; for the reason for the interpretation given above is that the Arabs often called a thing by the name of the recompense it brought, because of the relation which exists, and the comparison which can be made between the name and the recompense, since acts which bring a certain requital can fittingly be called by its name [6].

Allãh says: *Those who consume the property of orphans un-*

justly, they only consume fire in their belies [4:10]. Thus, He called the consumed property, though in itself good, fire, because the punishment for it is fire.

6. THE ATTRIBUTION OF FORGETFULNESS TO ALLÃH

Abū Ja‘far cites: "Forgetfulness, like beguiling, can only be applied to Allãh in the sense that with this He will requite the evil-doers."

Abū ‘Abdillãh adds that the true interpretation is not what has been advanced, because forgetfulness literaly signifies both abandonment and postponement. Allãh, the Exalted, says: *Whatever verse We abrogate or cause to be forgotten, We bring one better than it or the like of it* [2:106]. Now, here, 'what We abrogate' means, 'We leave it in place or suspend it'. Hence, the Exalted, means by 'They forget Allãh', that 'they departed from their obedience to Allãh', and He meant by 'so He forgot them', that, 'He withdraws His mercy from them'. and He means by: *So He makes them forget their own souls* [59:19] that 'He made them uneasy through His withdrawal, and that He obliged them to disregard their own good and not to care for their own interest'. This is a tenable interpretation of the verse, though the other one, advanced by Abū Ja‘far, is not refuted, and Allãh, the Exalted, is the granter of success.

7. THE ATTRIBUTES OF ALLÃH (*ṢIFÃT ALLÃH*)

Abū Ja‘far says: "Whenever we describe Allãh, the Blessed, the Sublime, by the attributes of His essence, . . ."[7]

Abū ‘Abdillãh, may Allãh have mercy upon him, adds that

the attributes of Allãh are of two categories: the first are those relating to His essence and called, for this reason, the Attributes of Essence (*ṣifãtu 'dh-dhãt*); the second category are those relating to His acts and called the Attributes of Action (*ṣifãtu 'l- fi'l*). The Attributes of Essence are those inherent in it, those of which the essence must necessarily be possessed, and hence cannot be separated from His essence. As for the Attributes of Action, they apply to Allãh only at the time of the action and not before it. Moreover, the Attributes of Essence involve the description of Allãh by epithets such as the Ever-living (*ḥayy*), the Powerful (*qãdir*), the Omniscient (*'ãlim*), which Allãh possesses eternally and forever, while the Attributes of Action, such as the Creator (*khãliq*), the Sustainer (*rãziq*), the Giver of new life (*muḥyi*, Revivifier), the Annihilator (*mumīt*), the Originator (*mubdī*), the Resurrector (*mu'īd*), are applicable only after the action and not before it. The (second) distinction between the Attributes of Essence and those of Action is that, in the case of the Attributes of Essence, the opposite cannot be predicted of the One Who is in possession of them, and cannot be separated from them (i.e., these attributes), whilst in the case of the Attributes of Action, their opposites can be predicted to the Possessor, and He can be separated from them. You cannot say, for example, that He dies or is weak, or is ignorant, and you cannot describe Him as being anything other than Living, Knowing and Powerful, whilst you can say that Allãh is not a Creator today, He is not the Giver of sustenance to Zayd, or that He is not the Giver of new life (Revivifier), or that He is not the Originator of something at this particular time, or He is not the Restorer of it. Furthermore, Allãh can be described by such antonyms as He gives and withholds, causes to live and causes to die, He originates and resurrects, He brings into existence and annihilates. This is the salient point[8] which should be considered

concerning the Attributes of Essence and Action; and the distinction between them.

8. THE BELIEF CONCERNING THE ORIGINATION OF HUMAN ACTIONS

ash-Shaykh Abū Ja'far[9], may Allãh have mercy upon him, says: "Human actions are created (*makhlūqah*), in the sense that Allãh possesses fore-knowledge (*khalq taqdīr*) [of them], and not in the sense that Allãh compels mankind to act in a particular manner by creating a certain disposition (*khalq takwīn*). The meaning of all this is that Allãh never ceases to be aware of the potentialities (*maqãdir*) of human beings."

Abū 'Abdillãh, may Allãh have mercy upon him, says: The correct doctrine transmitted from the Family of the Prophet (*Ahlu 'l-Bayt*), may Allãh bless him and his progeny, is that, "the actions of men are not created by Allãh", and what is related by Abū Ja'far is not a genuine traditions, and the authority for it not acceptable. On the contrary, the genuine reports are diametrically opposed to it, so if this were so – as the unscrupulous scholars maintained – then it could be said, for instance, that he who knew the Prophet 'created' him, or he who knew something about what the Almighty Allãh has fashioned and proved it for himself (i.e., confirmed his belief in it) created this particular thing. Thus the (rational) argument shows that this is a fallacy which even the rank and file of the Imãms' following would not perpetrate, least of all the Imãms themselves, peace be upon them. Predestination, however, linguistically implies creation, since to determine a thing involves action, while the knowledge, or conception, of a thing does not; yet in all circumstances Allãh, the Exalted, is far removed from the creation of abominable or base deeds.

It has been related that Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Muḥammad

ibn 'Alī ibn Mūsã ar-Riḍã, peace be upon them, was asked about human actions, whether they are created by Allãh; he, peace be upon him, answered: "If He created their actions, He would not have dissociated Himself from them. Whereas He, the Exalted, stated that: *Allãh renounces the polytheists* (as does also) *His Messenger* [9:3], which signifies that He dissociates Himself from their polytheism and base actions, and not from their beings."

Abū Ḥanīfah asked Abu '1-Ḥasan Mūsã ibn Ja'far, peace be upon them both, about human actions, and from whom they proceed; he replied that there were three alternatives:-

i) that all actions are from Allãh, the Sublime, or,

ii) that they proceed jointly from man and Allãh, or

iii) that they are from man alone.

Now, if they were all from Allãh, the Sublime, then He alone deserves to be praised for their goodness or to be blamed for their baseness, and so praise or blame for them pertain to none save Him; if they are created jointly by Allãh and His servant, then the praise or the blame would pertain to them both. Since these two alternatives are absurd, it is self-evident that human actions are all from men; it rests with Him; if He pleases, He has the right to punish them for their wickedness, or if He pleases He will pardon them, for the reward of piety and forgiveness is in His hands. And there are still further traditions and reports which can be adduced in support of this.

9. CONCERNING HUMAN ACTIONS (*FAṢLUN FĪ AF'ÃLI 'L-KHALQ*)

However, it is an established fact that the Book of Allãh, the Exalted, takes precedence over the traditions and reports. Hence it should be the touchstone for determining the genuine reports and the fabrications. (If this fact is admitted), then what-

ever the Qur'ãn approves is absolutely true, and should be followed and that alone. Now, the Almighty says: *Who has created all things well, and He originated the creation of man out of clay* [32:7]. So He declares that whatever He has created is good and far from being abominable; had He created abominable actions, He would never have characterized them as praiseworthy actions. Moreover, the affirmation that what Allãh has created is good refutes the assumption of those who maintained that Allãh is the Creator of base actions. The Almighty also says: *Thou seest not in the creation of the All-merciful any imperfection* [67:3], and since unbelief and falsehood are defects, so also is self-contradictory speech; how, then, can they attribute human actions to Allãh, knowing that they are full of defects and contradictions, when Allãh Himself denounced and rejected such attributions, and affirmed that: *Thou seest not in the creation of the All-merciful any imperfection*.

10. PREDESTINATION AND FREE WILL (*AL-JABR WA 'T-TAFWĪḌ*)

ash-Shaykh Abū Ja'far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, says: "There is neither (complete) compulsion (or constraint) (on human beings), nor (complete) delegation (or freedom), but the matter is midway between the two [extremes] (*amrun bayna amrayn*)." Then he adduces, to support this definition, a *mursal* tradition. He was asked to define what was meant by 'an affair midway between the two'. He said: "For instance, you see a man intent upon a crime and you forbid him to do it, but he does not desist, and you leave him; then he commits the crime. Now, because he did not accept (your advice) and you left him, this does not mean that you are the person who commanded him to commit the crime."

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd, may Allãh have mercy upon him,

comments that *jabr* is compulsion in respect of an act, and constraint by reason of coercion or overpowering; this involves the creation of an act in a living being without his having the power to reject or avoid it. It may convey, also, an action which, although within human capacity, a man might perform under compulsion or out of fear or constraint by reason of coercion. Nevertheless, it originally conveys the meaning of the performance of an act without having the power to avoid it, as has been demonstrated above. Thus, if the above-mentioned definition of *jabr* (compulsion) is approved, then it represents precisely the doctrine of the advocates of the belief that actions are created by Allãh. This is because they hold that Allãh has created the capacity in human beings, and that it is valid for one single action, and not for both the action and its opposite. And they maintain that Allãh has created evil in human beings. So, they are, in fact Predestinarians (Mujabbirah) and uphold predestination unquestioningly.

As for delegation (*tafwīḍ*)[10], this means the lifting of the restrictions religion imposes on human beings – together with absolute freedom and licence in their actions – and this is the doctrine of the dualists and nihilist (*az-Zanãdiqah wa aṣḥãbu 'l-ibãḥãt*)[11].

(We believe) that the correct doctrine is a middle course between these two extremes. Hence, although Allãh has enabled man to act by virtue of the capacity with which He has endowed him, nevertheless, He has imposed with this restrictions, has delineated man's course of action, and has admonished him against abominable acts, through intimidation, and by His promises and threats; by thus enabling them, He does not constrain them to particular actions. On the other hand, as He forbids many actions to men, and places limitations on them and commands them to do good and admonishes them against evil, (this shows that) He does not delegate the

performance of their actions to them completely. This is the distinction between Compulsion and Delegation, as we have made it clear above.

11. THE BELIEF CONCERNING ALLAH'S INTENTION AND WILL (*AL-MASHĪAH WA 'L-IRÃDAH*)

ash-Shaykh Abū Ja‘far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, says: "Allãh wills (*shã’a*) and intends (*arãda*), and He does not like (to be disobeyed) and He does not approve (of it); it is His will that nothing should take place except that of which He has knowledge, and His intention is the same."

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd, may Allãh have mercy upon him, comments that what has been mentioned by Abū Ja‘far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, in this respect is not clear and leads to error and confusion, because he relied on the apparent meaning of divergent traditions (*aḥãdīth mukhtalifah*)[12] and following the transmitters without critical insight.

The fact of the matter is that Allãh wills only good acts and intends only those that are seemly (becoming), and He does not will base actions, and does not intend sins. Allãh is Exalted far above what the liars assert. Allãh says: *And Allãh wishes no injustice for His servants* [40:31], and He, the Sublime, says: *Allãh desires ease for you and desires not hardship for you* [2:185]; and He, the Sublime, says: *Allãh desires to make* (things) *clear to you, and to guide you in the ways of those who were before you* [4:26]. He, the Sublime, says: *And Allãh desires to turn to you* (mercifully), *and those who follow their lusts, desire that you should deviate* (with great deviation) [ibid.:27]. Also, He, the Sublime, says: *Allãh desires to make your task light for you, for man is created weak* [ibid.:28]. Thus, He, the Praised, declares that He desires not hardship for

His servants, instead He desires ease for them, and He intends to guide them, and He does not intend to delude them, and wills that their burdens should be light and He does not wish to overburden them. So, if He wills that they should sin, then He would never have wished that they should be shown the way and that their burden should be made light and their path easy, whereas the Book of Allãh bears witness to the opposite of what those in error assert falsely, that Allãh is Exalted above the assertion of the evil-doers.

As for the saying of Allãh: *Whomsoever Allãh desires to guide, He enlarges his breast to Islam; *and whomsoever He desires to lead astray, He makes his breast narrow and constricted* [6:125]*[13], on which the Predestinarians are dependent in this matter, then there is no support for the advocates of predestination in this; since the meaning of the verse is that if Allãh intends to bestow His grace and favour on man as the reward of his obedience, then He will enlarge his breast to Islam and endow him with His favours, by which he is enabled to continue in obedience. Thus, *hidãyah* (guidance) signifies here *niʿmah* (grace). Allãh says in the Qur'an, relating the speech of the people of Paradise: *All praise is due to Allãh, Who guided us to this* [7:43], which means, 'Praise be to Allãh Who favoured us with His guidance and rewarded us for it'. In the same manner, *ḍalãl* (error) is equivalent to punishment in the saying of Allãh: *Surely the sinners are in error and insanity!* [54:47]. Thus Allãh called His punishment error and His grace guidance, and this because basically 'error' is equivalent to 'destruction' and 'guidance' to 'salvation'. Allãh, the Almighty, relating the speech of the Arab polytheists, says: *What, when we have gone astray in the earth, shall we indeed be* (again) *in a new creation?* [32:10], which means, 'when we have been destroyed'. Thus the meaning of the verse, 'If Allãh wills to guide' and 'If Allãh wills to lead him astray', is as

demonstrated above; as, also, the interpretation of the saying of Allãh, 'makes his breast narrow and constricted', is that He will withhold His succour from him as punishment for his rebelliousness and deprive him of the favours He bestowed upon him in retribution for his evil doing. Hence, the enlarging of the breast is the reward for obedience shown by men which itself came only by the succour of Allãh, (*sharḥu 'ṣ-ṣadr*: *thawãbu 'ṭ-ṭã'ah bi 't-tawfīq*), whereas the narrowing of the breast is the punishment of rebelliousness, which in itself results from the withholding of (Divine) succour, (*taḍyīqu 'ṣ-ṣadr*: *'iqãbu 'l-ma'ṣiyah biman'i 't-tawfīq*). Thus, there is no support in the verse given above for the opponents (i.e., opponents of free will), who allege that Allãh, Almighty, turns men away from faith, and prevents them from accepting Islam, and that it is His intention they should not believe and His will that they should err.

As for Allãh's saying: *And if thy Lord had willed, whoever is in the earth would have believed, all of them, all together* [10:99], it was only to stress His Omnipotence and that He is able – if He wills – to constrain them to believe by coercion and compulsion, but it is His will that they should believe freely and by choice. The rest of the verse makes this (i.e., what we have said) plain: *Will you then constrain men to become believers?* [ibid.]. He is able to constrain them to believe if He wills, but He does not, even though it would be an easy task for Him if He willed. All the other verses which they adduce in support of their opinion are to be interpreted in the same way. As for the Predestinarians (Mujabbirah) they avoid asserting that Allãh wills that He should be disobeyed or denied and that His saints should be killed and His friends abused, by saying that everything should be in accordance with His fore-knowledge, and He intends that disobedience to Him should be a sin and absolutely forbidden. In fact, they commit

the very error which they eschewed and implicate themselves in what they abhor, because it was in the eternal knowledge of Allãh that bad is bad, and what is in the eternal, universal knowledge of Allãh should be, then what is the validity of their fleeing from a thing to its double, and taking refuge from one meaning in another that exactly reproduces it. How can they deal like this with intelligent people? Is their assumption not like the assertion of one who says: "I do not abuse Zayd but I abuse Abū ‘Amr, and they are one and the same." And, like the self-contradictory speech of the Jews who said: "We do not deny Muḥammad (peace be upon him and his progeny) but we deny Aḥmad." This is but foolishness and ignorance on their part, and futile and weak effort on the part of those who rely on it.

12. THE BELIEF CONCERNING DESTINY AND DECREE (*AL-QAḌÃ’ WA 'L-QADAR*)

ash-Shaykh Abū Ja‘far says[14], concerning the belief in Destiny and Decree, "Discussion of *qadar* is forbidden", and he narrates in support of this proposition an unauthentic tradition.

ash-Shaykh Abū ‘Abdillãh al-Mufīd, may Allãh have mercy upon him, comments that Abū Ja‘far relied in this on a *shãdhdh ḥadīth* – which can be interpreted in many reasonable ways well-known to learned men, even if they established it as sound and authenticated. Thus his proposition does not constitute a definitive description. It would have been better had he not indulged himself by discussing the matter without fully comprehending its meaning. *Qaḍã’* is a well-defined term in Arabic usage, as may be proved by the evidence of the Qur’ãn. *Qaḍã’* has four meanings:-

1. *Khalq* – 'creation', as is proved by the saying of Allãh, the Exalted: *Then He ascended Himself to heaven . . . So He*

created them (qaḍãhunna) *seven heavens in two days*" [41: 11-12], that is, He created them – seven heavens – in two days.

2. *Amr* – 'command', as is proved by the saying of Allãh, the Exalted: *And thy Lord has decreed* (qaḍã') *that you worship none but Him* [17:23], that is, thy Lord has commanded.
3. *I'lãm* – 'informing', as is proved by the saying of Allãh, the Exalted: *And we made known* (qaḍaynã) *to the Children of Israel* [ibid.:4], that is We have informed them and told them about what is going to happen before it comes into existence.
4. *al-Faṣl fi 'l-ḥukm* – 'arbitration', as is proved by the saying of Allãh, the Exalted: *Allãh judges* (yaqḍī) *with justice* [40:20], that is, He will arbitrate between the two litigants. Also His saying: *And judgment* (quḍiya) *shall be given between them with justice* [39:75], that is a judgment and arbitration will be given between them according to the right.

It has been said that *qaḍã'* has a fifth meaning which signifies the completion of an affair (*al-farãgh mina 'l-amr*), and called in evidence of this is the saying of Allãh, reporting the speech of Joseph: *The matter on which you ask My opinion is decreed* (quḍiya) [12:41], that is, has been accomplished. However, this fifth meaning is synonymous with that of creation.

Now, if the above-mentioned meanings of *qaḍã'* are approved as the only correct ones, then the assumption of the Predestinarians that Allãh ordained sin for mankind is invalid, because there are only four alternatives, (i) either they mean that Allãh has created sin in His creation; in that case they would have to say He created sin in His creation, and not that He had imposed sin upon them, since creation (by the rules of grammar) takes place in them (*al-khalq fĩhim*) and not upon them (*lã 'alayhim*). Even if this were not so, yet the Almighty

Allãh declared him a liar who alleges that Allãh has created evil as He says: *Everything that He created He made well* [32:7], so He disclaims baseness in His creation and postulates its goodness, and disobedience is unanimously held to be base. (ii) Nor can they allege that 'He decreed sin' has the meaning of 'He commanded it', since Allãh declared him a liar who upholds this, and the Almighty says: *Verily Allãh does not command indecency, do you say against Allãh that which you do not know?* [7:28]. (iii) It is equally absurd to conceive of *qaḍã'* in the sense that Allãh had informed men about it, since men do not know whether they will obey or rebel in the future, and they have no detailed knowledge of what their conduct will be in the future. (iv) Similarly, it is absurd to denote by *qaḍã bi 'dh-dhunūb* that Allãh has decreed sin for His creatures, since His decisions are all fair and right, and sin is from men alone; also this statement is unanimously admitted absurd.

Thus, it is self-evident that the assumption of those who attribute the creation of sin to Allãh is vain.

The argument given above, concerning *qaḍã'* and *qadar* makes it easy to perceive the correct doctrine on this question. We must admit that Allãh holds – in some measure – destiny and decree over His creation and over their actions. It is evident that we must understand by this, that *qaḍã'*, in the context of their good actions, is that He commands them, and, in the context of their base actions, that He forbids them, and, in the context of men themselves, that He created them, and, in the context of what (they acquire by His deed), that He brought it into existence for them. Similarly, by *qudrah*, in respect of the actions of the Almighty, its meaning should be understood as that He ordained it rightly and fittingly; and in respect of the actions of men that He commands good and forbids evil; and that He will reward or punish them. This is so because it is self-evident that whatever Allãh has decreed is for the good of

mankind and well-done; and far from frivolous. Thus, if Destiny and Decree, in speaking of the action of Allãh, are interpreted as has been illustrated, then their obscurity will vanish and (what they mean) can be demonstrated, and the truth will become apparent to the intelligent, and discussing them will not lead to corrupt doctrine and to deviation.

13. THE INTERPRETATION OF THE REPORTS CONCERNING *AL-QAḌÃ'* AND *AL-QADAR*

As for the reports which Abū Ja'far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, relates concerning the prohibition of discussion of *qaḍã'* and *qadar*, they can bear two meanings: first, that the prohibition is restricted to those people whose discussions result in corrupt doctrine and divert them from the faith; for they will not keep their religion intact unless they refrain from discussion and abstain from indulging in it. Thus, the prohibition does not necessarily apply to all those who have reached years of discretion (*mukallafīn*), since what is good for some might prove to be bad for others[15], *and, on the contrary, what is evil for some might be good for others*[16], and this demonstrates why the Imãms, peace be upon them, endeavoured to direct their followers in religion in accordance with what they knew to be in their best interest. Secondly, discussion *of *qaḍã'* and *qadar**[17] is probably prohibited, regarding the reasons and causes of what Allãh has created; and what He commands; and the religious duties He imposes; since the inquiry into, and asking for the causes and reasons of, creation and religious obligations are prohibited, because Allãh, the Exalted, has veiled these questions from the great majority of mankind. Do you not realize that no one is permitted to seek for the cause of the creation of all that has been created, in detail? And to ask,

'Why has He created this thing and that'?; until he has enumerated all created things and accounted for them. Nor is anyone permitted to ask, 'Why did He command this? and impose that? and forbid the other?' For His imposing this, and commanding that, is because He knows the best interests of His creation. Allãh, the Almighty, has not disclosed to any of His creatures the particular causes for what He has created or commanded or imposed, notwithstanding that He has stated *a priori* that He did not create His creation lightly (*'abath*), but He did – indeed – create them with a wise purpose (*lī ḥikmah*). Yet, both reason and scripture (*sam'*) support this. Allãh says: *We created not the heaven and the earth, and whatsoever between them is, as though* (we were) *playing* [21:16]. And He says: *Do you think that We created you only for sport* [23:115]. And He says: *Surely We have created everything in measure* [54:49], that is, justly and fittingly. And He says: *And I have created jinn and men, only that they might serve Me* [51:56]. And He says, concerning what He enjoins on us: *The flesh of them shall not reach Allãh, neither blood, but piety shall reach Him from you* [22:37].

Thus, it is likely that Allãh, the Almighty, might create one particular animal to the end that it will cause some unbelievers (to believe); or it might lead some fornicators to repent; or that it might benefit some of the faithfuls; or that some evil-doers might take heed from it; or for the sheer benefit or the animal itself; or that it might serve as a warning to someone, whether in the earth or in the heavens, the aspects of which are all beyond our grasp and far from our comprehension, though we have to believe *a priori* that all that Allãh has created is for a wise purpose and not for mere sport. It is also possible that its purpose is to draw us near to obedience to Him and to keep us from rebelliousness, and that service through prayer stands as a Divine favour either to all the worshipers, or to a few. Since all

these hidden aspects of the Divine ordinances have been veiled from us, and since no authority exists for inquiring into it or asking for deatiled explanation; though it is obligatory to believe that as a whole they have been created for a Divine purpose, hence it is forbidden to discuss *qaḍã'* and *qadar* in the context mentioned above.

At any rate, the foregoing argument is necessary only if the reports related by Abū Ja'far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, are approved sound; otherwise, if they are untrustworthy, then we are relieved of the duty of refuting it. As for the tradition which he related on the authority of Zurãrah[18], it is the only sound one of them all, and its meaning is obvious, and it is not difficult for the intelligent to comprehend. It confirms the soundness of the doctrine of the People of Justice (*ahlu 'l-'adl*), and demonstrates the falsity of the doctrine of the Predestinarians. Have you not understood and comprehended the tradition we related from Abū 'Abdillãh, peace be upon him, "When Allãh will collect or (assemble) men (creation) on the Day of Resurrection, He will ask them concerning what He had enjoined on them and will not question them concerning what He had destined for them?" Moreover, the Qur'ãn declares emphatically that men are responsible for their actions, so if their actions were decreed from Allãh, then He never would ask them about it, which demonstrates that the eternal decree means the 'creation of their things', and what this entails is that Allãh the Almighty will ask them only concerning what He enjoined on them in commanding them to do good deeds and to abstain from evil. Thus, according to this reasoning, the tradition mentioned above is an illustration supporting the foregoing explanation of *qaḍã'* and *qadar* which is comprehensible.

14. THE NATURAL RELIGION (*AL-FIṬRAH*)

Abū Ja‘far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, says, concerning the natural religion, that "Allãh has undoubtedly created man with a disposition towards (accepting) the Unity of Allãh (*tawḥīd*)".

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd, may Allãh have mercy upon him, adds that Abū Ja‘far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, mentions *fiṭrah* without expounding its meaning, and he related the tradition without referring to its implications. The explicit meaning of his saying (i.e., Imãm Ja‘far aṣ-Ṣãdiq, peace be upon him), "Allãh has created men", is that He brought them into existence in the beginning (*ibtada'ahum bi 'l-ḥudūth*), hence *fiṭrah* means to create. Allãh, the Almighty, says: *Praise belongs to Allãh, Originator of the heavens and earth* [35:1] which means the Creator of the heavens and earth in the beginning and for the time to come. He also says: *Allãh's pattern* (*lit.* origin) *upon which He modelled mankind* [30:30], which means design on the basis of (or proto-type upon) which He created mankind. And this is what aṣ-Ṣãdiq, peace be upon him, meant by his saying: "Allãh has created men with a disposition towards accepting the Unity of Allãh", which also signifies that Allãh created them to affirm His Unity and that they should hold Him One. Yet this does not imply that He willed them to accept His Unity, because if He did so, then the whole of mankind would be monotheists (*muwaḥḥidūn*), whereas we see among ourselves those who are not, a fact which indicates that the Almighty has not decreed monotheism for mankind; rather He has created them to acquire it (through their own endeavour) – a fact which can be supported by the speech of Allãh: *I have not created jinn and mankind except to worship Me* [51:56], which plainly demonstrates that He has created them to worship Him.

He (Abū Ja'far) also has related a tradition which is accepted as genuine both by *al-'Ãmmah* and *al-Khãṣṣah*[19] (*lit.* the generality and elect) which runs thus, "Every infant is born according to the *fiṭrah*, then his parents make him a Jew or a Christian"[20], which also confirms the explanation mentioned above, which states that Allãh has created mankind to serve Him and with the disposition to affirm His Unity, hence whatsoever errors they commit on their own originate only from themselves and from the delusion of *jinn* and man with nothing from Allãh. As for the interpretation, Abū Ja'far brings forward concerning Allãh's right guidance to men, this states the case exactly, and he has followed the ideal course. And what he has mentioned is in accordance with the principle of Divine Justice, and approved by reason, and is contrary to what the Predestinarians maintain, who contradict the speech of Allãh and what is approved sound by reason.

15. CONCERNING HUMAN CAPACITY (*AL -ISTIṬÃ'AH*)

Abū Ja'far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, says concerning human capacity, that our belief in this (question) is what Imãm Mūsã ibn Ja'far, peace be upon both of them, said that "A human being has capacity, provided he possesses four characteristics, . . ."

Abū 'Abdillãh adds that what Abū Ja'far relates from Abu 'l-Ḥasan Mūsã, peace be upon him, on *al-istiṭã'ah*, is a *shãdhdh* tradition. *al-Istiṭã'ah*, that is, capacity for action, in fact, consists of health and soundness of limb. Thus, every healthy man is a capable agent, and becomes impotent and deprived of capacity only when he is not in possession of health. He would be a capable agent even if he were not in possession of the instrument necessary for the performance of the action. Then in that

case, he is a capable agent impeded from action, and being impeded does not nullify the capacity, but merely the action. In this way a man might be able to marry, though he has not found a woman to marry. Allãh, the Exalted, says: *And whoever among you cannot afford to marry free believing women . . .* [4:25], which states that a man is able to marry though he has not yet married, and that he is capable of performing the pilgrimage before doing so, and is capable of going out in the Holy War although he has not done so. Allãh Almighty says: *And they will swear by Allãh, if we had been able, we would have gone out with you* (Muḥammad) [9:42], which indicates that they were able to go forth, though they refrained from doing so. And He, the Exalted, says: *Pilgrimage to the House is a duty which men owe to Allãh, every man who is able to make his way thither* [3:97]. Thus, He prescribed pilgrimage for men, which implies that they possessed the capacity for it beforehand. Then how could Abū Jaʿfar claim that fornication is dependent on the presence of the woman; whereas we have demonstrated that a man possesses the capacity although he lacks her presence. Hence, if the tradition related by Abū Jaʿfar is proved to be sound, then the only meaning of the capacity is to facilitate the action and pave the way for it. Yet, as we demonstrated, the absence of the means does not involve impotency, and capacity exists in spite of the impediment. Since this subject is a controversial one, and if we deal with it at length it will be long drawnout indeed, then what we have established about it is sufficient to the intelligent.

16. CONCERNING *AL-BADÃʾ*

Abū Jaʿfar, may Allãh have mercy upon him, says: "Our belief concerning *al-badãʾ*. . ."

Abū ‘Abdillãh comments that the belief of the Imãmiyyah concerning *al-badã’* is approved by textual proof (*sam‘*) rather than reason, and further affirmed by the narrations related on the authority of the Divinely guided Imãms, peace be upon them. Originally, *al-badã’* means emerging (circumstances). Allãh says: *But there would appear to them from Allãh that on which they had not reckoned* [39:47], which signifies that the retribution which Allãh has prepared for them, and which they had not taken into account or consideration. And He says: *There would appear to them and surround them the evils of what they have amassed* [39:48]. That is, they will be confronted with the recompense which they have earned, and that this will be made plain to them. The Arabs used to say, "*badã lī fulãn ‘amal ḥasan*", that is, it appeared to him as a praiseworthy act. And also, "*badã lahu kalãm faṣīḥ*", that is, it seems to him an eloquent speech. Also they say, "*badã min fulãn kadhã*" – in some case the (*lãm*) may be substituted for (*min*). It will then read, "*badã lī fulãn*". The interpretation of what the Imãmiyyah meant by: "*badã lī Allãh fī kadhã*", is that something about (a particular thing) appeared to Him, the meaning of 'something about it appeared to Allãh" is that something (i.e., a particular statement) about it emerged from Him.

This is not to imply an amendment of opinion (on the part of the Almighty), or that the heart of the matter, from being unintelligible, has been made plain to Him, since all the works of Allah (which are now) apparent in His creation, although (at one time) not in existence, were always known to Him from eternity. Then the term *badã’* can only apply to things which are unexpected or the occurence of which was not taken into account, and can never apply to what was known to Him as bound to happen.

As for the saying of Abū ‘Abdillãh, peace be upon him:

"Allãh has never been influenced by a new consideration, as in the case of my son Ismã‘ĩl"[21], he meant by this what Allãh did for him in shielding him by abolishing the decree of death, although it was feared and expected for him; yet Allãh responded favourably to his petition by withholding this. The reports related on his authority, "that death was decreed for Ismã‘ĩl twice, but I requested Allãh to abolish it and He did", supports this. Nevertheless, there may be a decree which is suspended and may be changed in certain cases; Allãh says: *And He has decreed a term for you, and a term is fixed with Him* [6:2], which makes it clear that there are two different sorts of terms of which one is conditional (liable to change), and might be lengthened or shortened, as may be seen in the saying of Allãh: *And no one groweth old who groweth old, nor is aught lessened of his life, but it is recorded in a book* [35:11]. And His saying: *And if the people of the township had believed and kept from evil, surely We should have showered them with blessing from the heaven and from the earth* [7:96].

These verses demonstrate plainly that their terms were conditional, being lengthened in accordance with righteousness and cut short on account of evil. Allãh Almighty, reporting the speech of Noah, peace be upon him, says: *Ask forgiveness of your Lord; surely, He is ever forgiving, He will send down upon you rain pouring in abundance* [71:10-11]. So He made the length of their term and also the showering of His favour conditional upon their sincere contrition; then, when they failed (in this), He cut short their term and annihilated them. Thus, (the reasoned argument given above) affirms that *badã’* is concerned only with what is a conditional decree, and never involves a change of mind from one decision to another, or the mutability of opinion – Allãh is Exalted far above what the liars allege. Nonetheless, some of our companions asserted that originally *badã’* designated the amendment of opinion, and the

change of mind from one particular decision to another, and that it applied to Allãh only in its metaphorical sense, in the same manner as 'anger' and 'pleasure' were applied to Him metaphorically. Yet this assertion does not harm our School, since metaphorical nouns can be applied to Allãh if they are mentioned in Scripture (*lit.* authorized by *sam‘*, that is, textual proof), and *badã’* is, as we have demonstrated, one of these mentioned in Scripture. What was approved by us in our interpretation was that it has the meaning of 'emerging', as we demonstrated above, and it means merely the emergence of what was unexpected and extraordinary, since, if it comes to be generalized so as to cover each one of the particular actions of Allãh, then it will involve the attribution of mutability to Allãh, and this is unanimously held to be absurd.

17. CONCERNING RELIGIOUS DISPUTATION (*AL-JIDÃL*)

Abū Ja‘far says, concerning disputation: "Disputation concerning Allãh is prohibited, because it leads to that which does not befit Him"; then he quoted aṣ-Ṣãdiq, peace be upon him, as saying: "The speculative theologians (*ahlu 'l-kalãm*) will perish, and those who accept the faith without question will be saved".

Abū ‘Abdillãh ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd, may Allãh have mercy upon him, comments that: Disputation is of two kinds; true (i.e., a sincere quest after the truth) and false (i.e., discussion without the object of arriving at the truth or merely to find fault). The true disputation is recommended and desirable; whereas the false one is prohibited, and indulgence in it is abhorred. Allãh, the Almighty, admonishing His Messenger, says: *And argue with them in the best manner* [16:125], which obviously states the legality of arguing with opponents in order to convince them, since the disputation of the Prophet was true. Also Allãh, the

Almighty, addressing the whole Muslim community, says: *And argue not with the People of the Book except by what is best* [29:46]. Thus, He permitted them to argue with the People of the Book with what is best, and prohibited indulgence in false and base disputation with them. He, the Exalted, reporting the speech of the people of Noah, peace be upon him, in their disputation says: *They said, "O Noah! indeed you have disputed with us and prolonged dispute with us"* [11:32]. Thus, if disputation was altogether vain, then Allãh, the Almighty, would never have commanded His Prophet to adopt it, or the prophets before him to use it, and would not have allowed the Muslims to employ it.

As for the false disputation, Allãh, the Almighty, the Belessed, has described it in His saying: *Have you not seen those who dispute* (foolishly) *about the signs of Allãh, how they distort them?* [40:69]. Thus, He reproached their false disputation concerning the signs of Allãh, either to reject or to vilify them, or to cast suspicion on them. He, the Exalted, also reports the controversy of His friend, Ibrãhīm, with an unbeliver (concerning the existence of Allãh) and says: *Have not you thought of him who disputed with Ibrãhīm about his Lord* [2:258]. Also, reporting his refutation of his opponents, He says: *And that is Our argument, which We gave Ibrãhīm as against his people, We raise up in degrees whom We will* [6:83]. Also, commanding His Prophet (Muḥammad), peace be upon him and his progeny, to argue with his opponents, He says: *Say: "Have you any knowledge, for you to bring forth for us?"* [6:148]. And He, Exalted be His Name, says: *All food was lawful to the Children of Israel* [3:93], and telling His Prophet, says: *Whoever then disputes with thee in this matter after the knowledge that has come to thee* [3:61]. Moreover, the Imãms still continued to debate the religion of Allãh, and the learned amongst their followers in every age used to rely on sound argument and

reasoned proofs in their polemics, in order to establish the truth and refute the false, and the Imãms always praised them for that, and appreciated their efforts highly in this respect.

CHAPTER: al-Kulaynī[22], may Allãh have mercy upon him, relates in his book, *al-Kãfī*, which is one of the most admirable books of the Shī‘ah, the discussion Yūnus ibn Ya‘qūb[23] had with Abū ‘Abdillãh, peace be upon him, when the Shãmī[24] came to dispute with him. Abū ‘Abdillãh said to him: "O Yūnus! I wish that you had mastered speculative theology (*kalãm*)"; thereupon Yūnus replied: "May I be made your ransom! I have heard that you have forbidden people to dispute and that you have said; 'Woe unto those who indulge in dialectics, who say this is a tenable proposition, and this is not, this consistent and this not, and this is conceivable and this is not.'" Then Abū ‘Abdillãh said: "I called woe upon them if they abandoned my teaching and clung to what is opposite to it." Then he asked Ḥumrãn ibn A‘yan[25], Muḥammad ibn aṭ-Ṭayyãr[26], Hishãm ibn Sãlim[27] and Qays al-Mãṣir[28] to hold a debate before him and afterwards Hishãm[29] (ibn al-Ḥakam) came forward with his thesis (*lit.* apology); then the Imãm praised him and congratulated him, and said: "It is you who can dispute with the people." Also, (it has been related) that when he heard of the death of aṭ-Ṭayyãr, he said: "May Allãh have mercy upon him and show him splen-dour and happiness; indeed, he was vigorous in his defence of us, the People of the House." Abu 'l-Ḥasan Mūsã ibn Ja‘far, peace be upon him, said to Muḥammad ibn Ḥakīm[30]: "Dispute with the people and disclose the truth which you are following, and make clear the error into which they are fallen." Abū ‘Abdillãh (Ja‘far aṣ-Ṣãdiq), peace be upon him, said to some of our companions: "Debate with the people with my argument, and if they overcome you by argument, it will be I who am controverted,

not you." Also, he said to Hishãm ibn al-Ḥakam, after he had answered his question concerning the Names of the Almighty and their etymology: "Have you comprehended what I have explained to you to such an extent that you would be able to refute our heretical opponents and make their pol-emics of no effect?" "Yes," answered Hishãm. Then the Imãm said: "May Allãh help you". He also admonished a group of his followers and said: "Explain to the people the guidance which follow and show them the evils to which they adhere, and initiate (*bãhilhum fī 'Alī*) discussion with them concerning 'Alī." Thus, the report displays that he (Ja'far aṣ-Ṣãdiq) encouraged them to dispute with others, and he admonished them to com-prehend the methods of disputation, and recommended them to exert themselves in learning it. It has been related also that he (the Imãm) once forbade a man to dispute whereas he com-manded another to exert himself in acquiring this art: there-upon, some of his followers asked him: "May I be made your ransom! Why have you commanded one of them to master disputation whereas you forbade it to other?" He answered: "Because the first has a keen insight into the matter and is more informed about it than the other."

Thus, the argument mentioned above confirms the fact that for the two *ṣãdiq*s (i.e., the two veracious *imãm*s, Muḥammad al-Bãqir and his son, Ja'far aṣ-Ṣãdiq), prohibition only applies to a particular group of those who are not well-versed in it, and are uninformed in its methods, and whom dialectics confuse; and it (i.e., *kalãm*) is commanded for the other group who have perfected it and mastered its methods. As for the prohibition of disputation applied to Allãh, this is, in fact, limited to discus-sion regarding the drawing of comparison between Him and His creation, and also charging Him with injustice. But as for discussion about Allãh's unity and the denial of His resem-blance to His creation and the affirmation of His transcendence

and His glory, there are many traditions and narrations commanding and encouraging it. Some of these evidences I have recorded in my book *al-Arkãn fī da'ãimi 'd-dīn*, and I also wrote a comprehensive chapter in my book *al-Kãmil fī 'ulūmi 'd-dīn*. Also, on this subject, my book *'Uqūdu 'd-dīn*, contains a section; he who depends on it can dispense with everything else. Then it is self-evident that whosoever denies insight and reasoning bears witness to the weakness of his own opinion, and this displays his deficiencies in seeking knowledge and indicates his fall from the ranks of people of perception.

Also, we should discriminate between *naẓar* and *munãẓarah*, (i.e., 'insight' and 'disputation'), since it is permissible sometimes to restrain people from doctrinal disputation for the sake of their self-preservation (*at-taqiyyah*)[31], whereas it is not permissible, in any circumstances, to forbid them reasoning and insight; because to restrain them from exercising reason is to pave the way to blind imitation, which is sharply criticized by the unanimous opinion of the learned divines, as also by the plain text of the Qur'ãn and Tradition. Allãh, the Almighty, reporting the speech of the unbelievers, and reproaching their blind imitation says: *"Lo! We found our fathers upon a community, and we are following upon their traces."* [43:22], and also He, the Exalted, says: (And the Warner said:) *"What! even though I bring you a better guidance than you found your fathers following"* [ibid.: 24]. al-Imãm aṣ-Ṣãdiq, peace be upon him, says: "He who takes his faith from the mouth of men, men will make him slip (from the truth), but he who takes his faith from the Book and Tradition will never slip though mountains may slip (from their positions)." Also, he says: "Beware of blind imitation, because he who follows others blindly in his religion will be destroyed, since Allãh says: *They have taken as lords their Rabbis and their Monks* [9:31]. By Allãh they have never prayed for them nor fasted for their sake, but they de-

clared lawful what was forbidden, and considered forbidden for them what was lawful, and they followed them blindly in what they enjoyed and what they forbade, and therefore, they worshipped them unconsciously[32]. And he says: "He who responds to a Warner has worshipped him, then if he was sent by Allãh he has worshipped Allãh, and if he was from Satan, then he has worshipped Satan."

(The logical conclusion of our argument, then is that) if blind imitation was approved and insight was vain, then to imitate one group is no more praiseworthy than to imitate another, and also, whoever erred through imitation would have been excused, and whoever follows an innovator would not have sinned. But this is an assumption which no one (endowed with reason) would assert; thus, it is a self-evident fact that reasoned speculation is right, and sincere disputation is approved, and as for the traditions which Abū Jaʿfar, may Allãh have mercy upon him, related their true interpretation is the one which we have put forward, and the real meaning is not what he has imagined. And Allãh is the truest supporter.

18. THE BELIEF CONCERNING THE TABLET AND THE PEN (*AL-LAWḤ WA 'L-QALAM*)

ash-Shaykh Abū Jaʿfar, may Allãh have mercy upon him, says: "Our belief concerning the Tablet and the Pen is that they are two angels."

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd, may Allãh have mercy upon him, adds that the Tablet is the Book of Almighty Allãh in which He has written all that will be till the Day of Resurrection. In the Qur'ãn we have: *And We have written in the Psalms after the reminder, verily, my righteous servants shall inherit the earth* [21:105]. Thus, the Tablet means 'the reminder' (*dhikr*). 'Pen' is

the name of that thing by whose instrumentality Allãh has caused the writing on the Tablet. Hence, Allãh has ordained the Tablet to serve as an original record, through which the angels, peace be upon them, acquire the knowledge of what is going to happen concerning what is hidden and what is inspired. When Allãh intended to acquaint the angels with some secret of His, or send a revelation (through them) to one of the prophets, peace be upon them, He commands them to consult the Tablet, and from this they memorize the ordinances which are to be communicated to those to whom they have been sent, and thus they are informed of what they have to do. This interpretation, moreover, was confirmed by the reports related on the authority of the Prophet and the Imãms, peace be upon them all. As for those who maintained that the Tablet and the Pen are two angels, they have indeed deviated from the truth, since angels cannot be called tablets or pens, and since there are no linguistic precedents for an angel or human being called tablet or pen.

19. THE METAPHYSICAL MEANING OF THE THRONE (*AL-‘ARSH*)

ash-Shaykh Abū Ja‘far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, says: "Our belief concerning the Throne is that it is the support of the whole creation."[33]

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd, may Allãh have mercy upon him, comments that 'Throne' linguistically means 'kingdom': the poet says:

When the dominion of Banū Marwãn shall have departed,
and been effaced as were Iyãd and Ḥimyar,

which means when the kingdom of Banū Marwãn (the Umayyids) is destroyed and they are effaced. Another says: "Do you think that your throne will never vanish or change?", which means, 'Do you think that your kingdom will never vanish or

change?' Allãh, the Almighty, relating the speech of those who describe the kingdom of the Queen of Sheba says: *She has been given of everything, and she possesses a mighty throne* [27:23], which means that she has got a mighty kingdom. Then it follows from this that the Throne of Allãh, the Almighty, is His Kingdom, and seating Himself upon the Throne is equivalent to establishing His sovereignty over His Kingdom. The Arabs often substitute *istiwã’*, that is, seating oneself upon, for *istīlã’*, that is, to take possession of. The poet says:

Bishr has seated himself on Iraq,
without recourse to sword or bloodshed,

which means that he has dominated Iraq. As for the Throne (*‘arsh*) which is carried by angels, it is only a portion of the Kingdom of Allãh, and it is a Throne which Allãh created in the seventh heaven which is carried by angels in adoration and glorification of Allãh; as He has erected a house on the earth (i.e., Ka‘bah) and commanded man to make it their goal, visit it and perform the pilgrimage to it and glorify it. It has been handed down in tradition that Allãh Almighty has created a house beneath the Throne and called it al-Baytu 'l-Ma‘mūr (i.e., the ever-prosperous house), to which the angels make their pilgrimage every year. Also, He established a house in the fourth heaven and named it aḍ-Ḍurãḥ, to which the angels, in obeisance to Allãh, make their pilgrimage, venerate it, and accomplish the circumambulation of it; and He created al-Baytu 'l-Ḥarãm on the earth and placed it beneath aḍ-Ḍurãḥ. It has been related that aṣ-Ṣãdiq, peace be upon him, has said: "If a stone were to be thrown down from the *‘arsh* it would fall on the back of al-Baytu 'l-Ma‘mūr, and if it were to be thrown from al-Baytu 'l-Ma‘mūr, it would fall on the back of al-Baytu 'l-Ḥarãm." (Thus it is self-evident) that Allãh, the Exalted, has not created a Throne for Himself to settle in (Allãh is Exalted far above that!), but He created the Throne and appropriated it

to Himself to increase its greatness and glory, and required His angels to make obeisance in bearing it. Also, He established a House on earth which He has not created for Himself, nor that He should dwell therein; Allãh is Exalted far above that – but He created it for His creation and appropriated it to Himself that they should honour and venerate it, and He required them to visit it and make pilgrimage to it as obeisance to Him. As for the description of *'ilm* (knowledge) as *'arsh*, it is purely metaphorical. Therefore, it is not justifiable to interpret the meaning of the speech of Allãh, the Almighty: *The All-compassionate sat Himself upon the Throne* [20:5], in the sense that He is the Omniscient. The only rational interpretation is the one we put forward above.

As for the traditions related about the angels as being bearers of the Throne, they are all *aḥãd* traditions, and based upon the authority of a single narrator. Hence, the reports cannot be allowed as genuine, nor can they be used as a basis for practice. Yet it is more reasonable to hold a non-committal view about them. Then it is obvious that the only tenable doctrine is that 'Throne' means kingdom, and that the *'arsh* which is carried by angels is only a portion of the Kingdom (*mulk*), by the bearing of which Allãh ordered angles to make obeisance to Him.

20. CONCERNING SOULS AND SPIRITS (*AL-ARWÃḤ WA 'N-NUFŪS*)

ash-Shaykh Abū Ja'far says: "Our belief concerning souls is that they are spirits, and that they were the first of created things; and that they were created for eternal existence; and that they are strangers in the earth and imprisoned in their bodies."

ash-Shaykh Abū 'Abdillãh says that Abū Ja'far's discussion

of souls and spirits is based upon conjecture with no scientific investigation. It would have been wiser had he contented himself with the mere mention of the reports, without involving himself in intricacies of inner meaning, since he is not well-equipped for such a task.

As for 'soul'[34], it has different meanings:

1. The essence of a thing (*dhãtu 'sh-shay'*);
2. The moving blood (*ad-damu 's-sãil*);
3. The breath which is the wind (*an-nafas*);
4. Desire and passion (*al-hawã*).

Now, the proof of the first meaning is the saying: "This is the very thing itself, that is, its essence and it itself." And the proof of the second meaning is the saying: "Whatsoever is classified as an animal with circulating blood is to be judged thus and thus." And the proof of the third meaning is the saying: "So-and-so has perished, if he ceases to breathe and no air remains in his body to inflate his lungs." And the proof of the fourth meaning is the speech of Allãh; *Surely, the soul of man incites to evil* [12:53], which means passion instigates evil. Soul (*nafs*) might designate the meaning of retribution, the proof of which is the saying of Allãh, the Almighty: *And Allãh biddeth you beware of Him* (nafsahu) [3:28], which means 'of His retribution and punishment.'

Rūḥ (i.e., Spirit), also has several meaning:

1. Life (*ḥayãt*);
2. Qur'ãn;
3. A particular one of the angels of the Almighty Allãh (*malak*);
4. Jibrīl.

Now, the proof of the first meaning is the saying: "Everything that is classified as being endued with spirit is to be judged thus and thus," by which they mean every being that has life, and their saying in respect of him who died, "he gave

up the Ghost", (*lit.* the spirit went out of him), which means his life. And the same is their description of the embryo, "a form not endued with spirit", which means that it lacks life. And the proof of the second meaning is the speech of Allãh: *So We have revealed to thee a spirit of Our command* [42:52], which means here the Qur'ãn. And the proof of the third meaning is the speech of the Almighty: *Upon the day when the spirit and the angels stand in ranks* [78:38]. And the proof of the fourth meaning is the saying of the Almighty: *Say, "The Holy Spirit has revealed it"* [16:102], that is, Jibrīl, peace be upon him.

As for the narrations which Abū Ja'far reports, that souls were created two thousand years before the bodies; and that those of them who were acquainted with each other are intimate, and those who were strangers to each other are disparate[35], it is, in fact, an *aḥãd* tradition and a report unsupported except by one narrator. Nevertheless, it bears an interpretation which differs from that adopted by those who are not acquainted with the fact of the matter. Hence, the sound interpretation is that Allãh, the Exalted, created the angels two thousand years before mankind; then those amongst them who were acquainted with each other before the creation of men are also intimate after the creation of men; whereas those among them who were strangers to each other before, are also strangers after the creation of men. Then, the reality is far from what is maintained by the adherents of transmigration. This specious doctrine has crept into the Hashwites in the ranks of the Shī'ah; who erroneously alleged that our beings which are subject to the commands and prohibitions of Allãh were created in the world of atoms (*'ãlamu 'dh-dhar*), and that they were acquainted with each other and endued with the faculties of discernment, comprehension and speech; then Allãh created bodies for them after that and put them together. (Do they not realize) that if this were so, then we would know the state which we occupied before, and that if it

were recalled to us, we would remember it and nothing of it would be hidden from us? Do you not realize that if someone was brought up in a place and settled there for a year, and then turned away from it to a second place, he will never forget what he knows about it; and that if he forgets it through absent-mindedness, it would be easy for him to remember it if he was reminded of it? If this was so, then would it be probable that one of us who was born in Baghdad and settled there for twenty years and then emigrated to another place, would forget all that happened to him at Baghdad even if he were reminded of it in detail? In fact, this is an assumption which no one endowed with reason will make.

It would have been wiser for those who are not well-equipped for such a task to deal with the subject without applying any discussion. What Abū Ja'far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, maintained about spirits and souls is unwittingly the actual doctrine of transmigration. So, he committed a fearful crime against himself and others.

As for his opinion regarding the perpetuity of the soul, it is, indeed, a statement to be castigated, since it contradicts the plain meaning of the Qur'ãn. Allãh, the Almighty, says: *All that dwells upon the earth is transient, and none endures for ever but the Face of thy Lord, Majestic, Splendid* [55:26-27]. Thus, what he narrated and erroneously assumed is, in fact, the doctrine of the majority of the heretical philosophers who maintain the eternity of the soul and its incorruptibility and perpetuity, and advocate the opinion that the soul abides, and that it is only the body that undergoes degeneration and corruption. The same opinion was held by some of the adherents of transmigration, who claim that souls recur perpetually in different forms and bodies, and that neither are they contingent nor will they corrupt or be annihilated. This is one of the most monstrous claims and far removed from the truth. Comparable to it in

wickedness and error is the charge of the Nãṣibah[36] (that)[37] these are the real doctrines of all the Shī‘ah; on the strength of which they brand them with heresy. Thus, if those who gave authority to such traditions had been aware of the dangers that lay in them, they would never have affirmed them. However, the indiscriminating of our companions, who are incapable of accurate judgment and sound comprehension, often accept the traditions at their face value without checking their authority, and do not distinguish between the true and the absurd without realizing what follows from accepting them or comprehending the real meaning of what they affirm.

What has been affirmed by (genuine) traditions in this respect is that souls after death are of two kinds: those which proceed to reward or punishment; and those which are abolished and therefore known neither reward nor punishment. A tradition has been related from aṣ-Ṣãdiq, peace be upon him, which confirms and clarifies this interpretation. He was asked: "What will happen to the spirit of the dead? and where will it abide?" He replied: "The dead are of two categories: (a) Either purely faithfully, or (b) purely wicked; then the spirits of each passes from his body (*lit.* house-*haykal*) to its like, and each is rewarded for its acts till the Day of Resurrection. On the Day of Ressurrection Allãh will restore his body and insert his spirit into it, and call him to accept the final judgment for his deeds. The spirit of the faithful will pass from his dead body to a similar form, and abide in a paradise of Allãh, where he will enjoy a perpetual grace till the Day of Resurrection. But the unbeliever's spirit will pass to a form similar to itself and abide in fire and torture till the Day of Resurrection. And that this is the lot of the believer is proved by the speech of Allãh: *It was said: "Enter paradise". He said: "Ah! Would my people had knowledge that my Lord has forgiven me . . ."* [36:26-27]. And that the unbeliever's state is as has been mentioned is proved

by the speech of Allãh: *The Fire, to which they shall be exposed morning and evening, and on the Day when the Hour is come*[*]*: "Admit the people of Pharaoh into the most terrible chastisement!"* [40:46][38]. Thus, He, the Exalted, tells that a believer, after his death as he is admitted to paradise, says: "Ah! Would that my people had knowledge that . . ." Also, He relates that an unbeliever is admitted to chastisement after his death and that he is tortured morning and evening until the Day of Resurrection he will be made to abide in Hell.

As for him who falls into oblivion (*man yulhã 'anhu*), his spirit will be destroyed after the decomposition of his body; thus, he will be aware of nothing till the Day of Resurrection. This is the state of those who are neither purely faithful nor purely wicked. Allãh Almighty speaks of their state and says: *He of them who was fairest in the way will say: "You have terried only a day*" [20:104]. Thus, He demonstrates that a certain group of people on the Day of Resurrection will not remember how long they were in the tombs, so that some will assume that they were in them ten days, and some will suppose a day only. This, of course, cannot be the state of those who have been tortured or blessed until the Day of Resurrection, since he who has enjoyed perpetual pleasure or punishment will not forget the treatment he experienced, not will he be uncertain about it in his life after death. It was related from Abū 'Abdillãh, peace be upon him, that he said: "Only those who are purely faithful or purely unbelievers will be questioned in the grave, whereas the others will fall into oblivion." He said concerning the second coming (*ar-raj'ah*): "Those who will return at the coming of the Qãim (the Holder), peace be upon him, will be only those who are purely faithful or purely unbelievers; as for the others, there will be no return until the Day of Resurrection."

Also, our companions are of different opinions concerning

the question of what is the subject of bliss or punishment. Some are of the opinion that the subject of the eternal bliss or punishment is the spirit to which are addressed the commandments, prohibitions and legal obligations, and they call it a 'substance' (*jawhar*), others say that spirit is the same life which enters a body which is the replica of that of its lifetime on earth. Both suggestions are, in fact, conceivable by reason, but the more likely, to my mind, is the one which defines the spirit as 'the substance which Allãh commands' (*al-jawharu 'l-mukhãtab*), and this is what the philosophers name 'the simple' (*al-basīṭ*). It has been related in the traditions that the prophets, peace be upon them, in particular, and the Imãms, peace be upon them, after them will be translated to the heavens both body and spirit, where they will enjoy the Divine bliss in their earthly bodies which they inhabited in the lifetime. But this is a privilege restricted to the Proofs of Allãh (*Ḥujaj Allãh*) only. Also, it is related from the Holy Prophet, peace be upon him and his progeny, that: "He who prays for me by my tomb I will hear him, and he who prays for me from a remote place, his prayer will reach me." He, peace be upon him and his progeny, said: "He who prays for me once, I will pray for him ten times, and he who prays for me ten times I will pray for him a hundred times, then let your prayers for me be many or few." Thus he, peace be upon him and his progeny, made it clear that after he had left the world he would hear the prayer devoted to him, a fact which implies that he is alive with Allãh, the Almighty. The state of the Imãms (*lit.* the Righteous Guides) is the same as those who hear the prayers of a Muslim close at hand or receive his prayer if far away. This is affirmed by sound narrations related on authority. Allãh Almighty says: *Account not those who were slain in Allãh's way as dead, nay they are alive* [3:169].

It has been related from the Holy Prophet, peace be upon

him and his progeny, that he stood by the pit of Badr and addressed the unbelievers' corpses, who were slain and thrown into a pit: "You were an evil kinsfolk to the Messenger of Allãh (peace be upon him and his progeny), you drove him out of his home and chased him away; then you flocked to fight against him. I have found that what my Lord promised me is true; have you found that what your lord promised you is true?"[39] ‘Umar exclaimed, "O Messenger of Allãh! What wisdom is there in addressing mouldering corpses?" Thereupon he replied: "Hush, O son of al-Khaṭṭãb! I swear by Allãh that you do not hear me better than they do, and nothing prevents the angels from clothing them with iron, but my turning my face from them like this."

It is related from ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭãlib, the Commander of the Believers, peace be upon him, that after the battle of Baṣrah[40] terminated, he began to inspect the ranks till he came across the corpse of Ka‘b ibn Sūr[41] – *(he was appointed a judge over Baṣrah by ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭãb and continued to hold office throughout the reigns of ‘Umar and ‘Uthmãn [ibn ‘Affãn]; when the civil war broke out at Baṣrah, he hung the Qur’ãn round his neck and incited all his family to fight the Commander of the Believers and they were all slain)*[42]. The Commander of the Believers asked that the corpse be raised by the help of two men. Then he addressed the body and said: "0 Ka‘b ibn Sūr! I have found that what my Lord promised me is true. Did you find that what your lord promised you was true?" Then he asked that the body be laid aside and went on a little; then he came across the slain body of Ṭalḥah ibn ‘Ubaydillãh, and asked that the body be raised, then addressed it and said: "0 Ṭalḥah! I have found that what my Lord promised me is true. Did you find that what your lord promised you was true?" Then he ordered the body to be laid aside. A man exclaimed: "0 Commander of the Believers! What was the wisdom of

talking to two slain bodies who were unable to follow you?" Thereupon he said: "By Allãh, 0 man! They heard me as the people of the pit (*qalīb*) heard the speech of the Messenger of Allãh." Thus, this is one of the narrations which affirms that some of those who die will have their spirits restored to them to enjoy bliss or suffer punishment of the grave; yet this is only an exception and not a general rule which applies to all the dead.

21. WHAT ASH-SHAYKH ABŪ JA'FAR HAS DESCRIBED ABOUT DEATH

Abū Ja'far says: "The Chapter of Death: the Commander of the Believers was asked . . ."

ash-Shaykh Abū 'Abdillãh says: "The chapter is entitled 'Death', yet he deals with something else, whereas it was for him to deal with the reality of death or to entitle the chapter 'On the results of death and how the dead shall fare finally.'"

Death is the opposite of life, nullifying growth and making sensation impossible; also it corrupts and obliterates it. It is the result of the direct act of Allãh, the Almighty; and no one has a hand in it or power over it, save Allãh, the Almighty. Allãh the Almighty, says: *It is He Who gives life and cause to die* [40:68]. Hence, He appropriates animation and killing to Himself. Also He, the Exalted, says: *Who created death and life, that He might try you; which of you is fairest in works* [67:2]. Life is that which has growth and sensation, and endows the one in possession of it with capacity and knowledge, whereas death is that in conjunction with which growth and sensation are im-possible and which deprives the dead of both ability and knowledge.

Allãh, the Almighty, deals death to His creatures in order to transfer them from the abode of action and trial to that of reward and retribution. Also, He makes none of them die save him for whom He knows that death is better than his continued life,

and preserves life only in those for whom He knows that life is better than death. However, what He deals with His creatures is, in truth, intrinsically good and most beneficial for them. He might put to trial most of His creatures by the severe pangs of death, or He might exempt them from that trial. Moreover, these pangs which precede death might stand as a punishment to those afflicted by them, or it might be that they serve to purify him or others (who are afflicted by them), yet a great advantage might follow from them and a full compensation. Also, not everyone who suffers severe pangs, before the passing of his soul, suffers them as punishment, nor is everyone who relinquishes his life easily favoured and rewarded thereby; also it has been related that the pangs which precede death serve as atonement for believers for their sins, or as a punishment for the unbelievers; also the ease which precedes death is either to seduce the infidels or to serve as reward for the faithful. Altogether, this is a question whose solution has been concealed to human intelligence; and Allãh, the Almighty, has disclosed nothing of it to His creatures, in order to stir them to discriminate between the state of trial and that of punishment, and the state of reward and that of seduction, or in order to increase the severity of the trial to its utmost extent, to accomplish the purpose divinely ordained for creation.

As for what Abū Ja‘far mentioned concerning the state which the dead occupy after their death – indeed detailed reports have been handed down concerning it – and what he mentioned was only some of it, which he erroneously listed in this chapter which is of different content. In any event, death is one of the greatest joys which confronts the faithful, since it marks the beginning of his way to the abode of favour, and by the means of which he achieves the reward of the good deeds of his lifetime; whereas, for the infidel it is the first calamity he is confronted with, and the beginning of his way to punishment,

since Allãh, the Al-mighty, postponed the retribution of his deeds until after his death by the means of which he is transformed from the abode of obligation to that of retribution. Indeed, the position of the believer, after his death, is more excellent than that before it, whereas the position of the infidel after his death is worse than that before it. This is so, because the believer is going to achieve his reward and the unbeliever is going to receive his punishment.

It has been related from the Family (*ãl*) of Muḥammad, peace be upon him and his progeny, that "The world is the prison of the believer, the tomb his house, and paradise his abiding place, whereas the world is the paradise of the infidel, the tomb his prison, and hell his abiding place." It is also related from them, peace be upon them, that they said: "Eternal bliss is after death and eternal affliction is after death." Yet we should be content with what the Qur'ãn states concerning the final outcome, irespective of what the narrations say; and what is approved by reason, irrespective of the traditions, since Allãh, the Almighty, has plainly stated the reward of the righteous and He has also mentioned the reward of the evil-doers, and enlarged on it; then what He, the Exalted, stated is sufficient without need of anything else.

22. THE BELIEF CONCERNING THE QUESTIONING IN THE GRAVE

Abū Ja'far says: "Our belief concerning the questioning in the grave is that it is true."[43]

Abū 'Abdillãh ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd, may Allãh have mercy upon him, adds that what is mentioned by Abū Ja'far does not tell all that should be told about the questioning and its purpose; what should be mentioned in this respect is what I am going to establish by the will of Allãh, the Exalted.

The genuine narrations which have been handed down from

the Holy Prophet, peace be upon him and his progeny, are to the effect that the angels will descend to men in the grave and question them regarding their faith. It is noteworthy that the different reports have a common tone. One of these runs thus: After death two angels of Allãh, the Sublime, named Munkar and Nakīr, come to the dead man and question him regarding his Lord, his Prophet his faith and his Imãm; if he answers according to the truth, they deliver him to the angels of bliss, and if he falters, they deliver him to the angels of punishment. Yet, some other reports name the two angels – who come to the unbeliever – Munkar and Nakīr, whereas those who come to the believer are called Mubashshir and Bashīr. It has been related that the two angels sent to the unbeliever are named thus, because he denies the truth, rejects and scorns what they bring him. The two angels sent to the believer are named Mubashshir and Bashīr because they bring him glad tidings and eternal reward from the Almighty Allãh. Moreover, these two names are not their personal names, but designate their acts. These, however, are reports close to each other in content, and of which the meaning is easily conceivable, yet Allãh, the Exalted, knows best the truth of it.

We have also mentioned above that the only people whom the two angels will question are those who are purely faithful or completely infidels, whereas all others will fall into oblivion. This is confirmed by the traditions handed down on this matter, and this is why we mentioned the above statement about it.

CHAPTER: (In point of fact) the two angels will question only him who is alive and him who can understand the content of the question, and is capable of conceiving its meaning. This is clear evidence that Allãh, the Almighty, will quicken the dead servant for questioning, and thereafter his life may be per-petuated for eternal grace, if he deserves grace, or for ever-lasting punish-

ment, if he deserves this; let us seek refuge in Allãh from His wrath, and let us beg His help to perform what He pleases.

The purpose for which the two angels descend and question the servant is that Allãh, the Almighty, will entrust the servant, after his death, to the angels of grace or punishment; they cannot discern what the servant is except as Allãh has instructed them. And of the two angels who come to the servant, one is from the angels of grace and the other is from the angels of punishment. When they descend to him, they will discern his state by questioning him. Thus, if his answers are satisfactory and deserving of Divine Grace, charge of him will devolve upon the angel of grace, whereas the angel of punishment will abandon him. And if he shows signs of deserving punishment, then he will be in the care of the angel of torment, whereas the angel of grace will abandon him. Also, it has been related that the angels appointed for reward and punishment are other than those who are appointed for questioning, and that the two angels of grace and punishment will be informed of what the servant deserves by the two angels of questioning, who have the task of questioning the servant and ascertaining what he deserves; they relate this to the angels of retribution and then they ascend to their post in heaven. These narrations are all permissible, yet we do not prefer one to another; since they are of similar import, and since our procedure, in such cases, is to be cautious and non-committal.

CHAPTER: The purpose for which Allãh, the Sublime, entrusts these tasks to the angels of questioning and the angels of punishment and grace, is that they worship Him through this, as is the case with the angels who show their worship through keeping record of the acts of mankind, inscribing, abrogating them and lifting the record (to Allãh), and as is the case with those who serve Allãh by preserving humanity from harm, or those who

are commissioned to destroy the nations, or those who bear the Throne, or those who circumambulate the Ever-prosperous House (al-Baytu '1-Ma‘mūr), or those who glorify Him or those who are charged with asking forgiveness for the faithful, or those who are employed in showing grace to the people of Paradise, or those who are assigned to torture the people of Hell. Thus, all worship Him to gain His grace and they do not serve Him in vain[44]; as men and *jinn* do not serve Him for play. But all worship Him, looking to His reward, or that He should make Himself known to them, or to show their thanks to Him, Who favoured them with His favours. For Allãh is able to punish him who deserves it, or to shower His grace upon him who merits it without mediators, for the reasons given above, and for the Divine wisdom as has been shown.

The position of the two angels who will come and question the dead after their depature from this world is a theme attested by textual proof (*as-sam‘*), whereas the question of Allãh quickening the dead at the time of questioning is a theme proved by reason, since questioning the dead or inquiring of an inanimate body is inconceivable, because speech is only valid with a rational being, capable of understanding speech, and approving it, and thereby bearing the responsibility for what was within his power. Yet it has been related that to everyone subject to questioning, life will be restored after death, that he may be capable of understanding what is addressed to him; thus the reports which are related confirm what has been proved by reason. And even if we lack traditions, then the proof of reason is, indeed, sufficient in this respect.

23. WHAT ASH-SHAYKH ABŪ JA‘FAR HAS MENTIONED ABOUT DIVINE JUSTICE

Abū Ja‘far says: "The chapter concerning Divine Justice . . ."

Abū ‘Abdillãh ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd adds: "Justice is the recompense of an action as it deserves, and injustice is the prevention of what is due." Allãh, the Most High, is the Generous, the Ever-giving, the All-gracious, the Compassionate, Who assures the reward for acts and fair indemnity for undeserved sufferings. Moreover, He has promised to bestow His grace in abundance and says: *For those who do good the reward is most fair and abundant* [10:26]. Thus, He states that the righteous will be requited with the reward they deserve and with His bounty. And He says: *He to whom a good deed is accredited shall be recompensed ten-fold*; which states that he would be endowed with ten-fold of what he deserves, and – *He to whom an evil-deed is accredited shall only be recompensed as it deserves and they shall not be wronged* [6:160] – which implies that he shall only be recompensed with the minimum of what he justly deserves. Also, He assures men of His pardon and promises to them His forgiveness, and He, the Exalted, says: *Thy Lord is forgiving to men, for all their evil-doing* [13:6]. And He, the Exalted, says: *Surely, Allãh will not forgive that a partner should be ascribed to Him; less than that He forgives to whomsoever He will* [4:48]. And He, the Exalted says: *In the bounty of Allãh and His mercy, in that let them rejoice* [10:58]. Yet, what right the servant might possess is that to which Allãh, the Sublime, has entitled him and is what is dictated by His generosity and bounteousness. Since, if He requited him in accordance with justice, he could never lay claim by right to all that with which Allãh has endowed him. Since, also, Allãh first showed His creation His favours, thereby obliging them to show their gratitude to Him, yet no one of His creatures is able to make an adequate return for the favours which He has showered upon him through his good acts, nor can anyone give thanks to Him without falling short of the gratitude worthy of the favour. Moreover, the People of the Qiblah (i.e., the Muslim

community as a whole) unanimously agreed to stigmatize as an evil-doer him who claims that he has fulfilled all the obligations Allãh has imposed upon him, and that he has given good measure in return for the favours with which Allãh has endowed him. Also, they agreed unanimously that, however, thankful they were to Allãh, they fell short of a worthy gratitude; and that even if their terms should be prolonged to the end of time, they would never fulfil their debts perfectly to Allãh, the Exalted.

Thus, the foregoing argument indicates that what He entitled them to claim as a deserved right is so, only because of His generosity, bounty and graciousness. In fact, rationally, there is a different between a thankful worker and one who does not work, and since the precedence and superiority of the worker are recognized over the idle man, then it must rationally be inferred that his praise is, in fact, considered due to him, and it must further be inferred that he is privileged above the idle man, for it would be only just that Allãh should requite him with what is his due according to reason. Above all, Allãh, the Almighty, commands justice and forbids wrong, and says: *Surely, Allãh commands justice and the doing of good* [16:90].

24. CHAPTER ON *AL-AʿRÃF*

Abū Jaʿfar says: "Our belief concerning *al-Aʿrãf* is that it is a dividing wall . . ."

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd comments that: "It has been said that *al-Aʿrãf* is a mountain midway between Paradise and the Fire. Also, that it is a dividing wall between Paradise and Hell. It is generally considered a (particular) place belonging neither to Paradise nor to Hell."

These interpretations are confirmed by traditions, which

furthermore, state that on the Day of Resurrection there will be found upon it the Messenger of Allãh, the Commander of the Believers and the Imãms from his progeny – may the blessing of Allãh be upon him and his family. Those are they whom Allãh, the Exalted, means by His saying: *And on the ramparts are men knowing each by their mark, who shall call to the inhabitants of Paradise: "Peace be upon you! They have not entered it, for all their eagerness"* [7:46], that is, because Allãh, the Almighty, will enable them to discriminate between the inhabitants of Paradise and those of Hell by signs resembling marks. This He illustrates further in His saying: "They know each by their mark". And also: *The sinners shall be known by their marks* [55:41]. He the Almighty, also says: *Surely in that are signs for such as mark; surely they are on a way still uneffaced* [15:75-76]. Thus, He tells that amongst His creatures there is a group which scrutinizes men and knows them by the marks they bear. It has been related from the Commander of the Believers, peace be upon him, that he has said in some of his narrations, "I am the holder of the baton and the clear-sighted", which means that he knows the state of him whom he scrutinizes carefully. It has been related from Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad al-Bãqir, peace be upon him, that he was questioned on the meaning of the speech of Allãh: "Surely in that are signs for such as mark[45], he said, "That it refers to us, the People of the House (i.e., the Imãms, peace be upon them)." It is also mentioned in the traditions that Allãh, the Almighty will place therein, that is, *al-A‘rãf*, a group of men who have failed to merit Paradise by their good acts and have not deserved punishment, yet they do not merit an eternal abode in Hell; among these are they who wait for the decision of Allãh and entertain hope of intercession; they will abide there till they are permitted to enter Paradise through the intercession of the Prophet, peace be upon him and his progeny, and the Commander of the Believers and

the Imãms, peace be upon them. It has been mentioned also that it is an abode of those who were not subject to any religious obligation in their lifetime, thus they do not deserve either Paradise or Hell; therefore Allãh will place them therein and recompense them with a certain grace which is far below that of those who merited it by the virtue of their acts. Hence, all that is mentioned above (concerning *al-A‘rãf*) is tenable by reason and confirmed by traditions, and yet Allãh best knows the truth. What is generally accepted regarding *al-A‘rãf* is that it is a place midway between Paradise and Hell; there will stand those whom we call the Proofs of Allãh to His creatures (*Ḥujaj Allãh*, that is, the Prophet and the Imãms); there, also, will be those whose final judgment has been deferred. Beyond this Allãh knows best what will be.

25. THE BELIEF CONCERNING THE BRIDGE (*AṢ-ṢIRÃṬ*)

*ash-Shaykh Abū Ja‘far says: "Our belief concerning *aṣ-Ṣirãṭ* is that it is true, and that it is a bridge"*[46].

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd says: *"aṣ-Ṣirãṭ*, linguistically means 'way' (*aṭ-ṭarīq*), hence religion is called 'the way', since it is the way to the right (path). That is why accepting the mastership of the Commander of the Believers and the Imãms of his progeny is called 'a way'. Similar to this is the saying of the Commander of the Believers, "I am the straight path of Allãh, and the most firm cord which is unbreakable", by which he meant that knowing him and adhering to him is the way to Allãh, the Exalted. It has been related that the way to Paradise on the Day of Resurrection is like a bridge over which people pass, and that is the bridge on the right side of which the Messenger of Allãh, peace be upon him and his progeny, will stand and the Commander of the Believers, peace be upon him,

on the left side, where they will receive the call from Allãh, the Sublime, *"Cast, you twain, into Hell every froward unbeliever"* [50:24]. It is also related that no one will be permitted to cross the bridge except those who hold with them a writ of immunity from the Fire (*barã'ah*), given by ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭãlib, peace be upon him. It is also related that the bridge is finer than a hair and sharper than a sword to the unbeliever – that is to say, the foot of the unbeliever will never stand firmly on it on the Day of Resurrection because of the dread and fear of that Day with which they will be confronted. Then they will walk on it as one who walks on a thing finer than a hair and sharper than a sword. Yet this is only an expression to illustrate the dread which afflicts the unbeliever when he crosses the bridge. It is a way either to Paradise or to Hell, and from which the servant may look out on Paradise or see the terrors of Hell.

aṣ-Ṣirãṭ might also signify a tortuous path, and this is why Allãh, the Almighty, says: *"And this, My path, is straight"* [6: 153]. Thus He distinguished His path which is the true religion, and which He ordered to be followed from those which lead astray. Also, the Almighty, in commanding His servants to pray and recite the Qur'ãn says: *Guide us in the straight path* [l:5], which indicates that the other paths are not straight and that the path of the Almighty Allãh is His religion, whereas the path of Satan is the path of rebelliousness. Thus, *aṣ-Ṣirãṭ*, as we demonstrated above, originally means path, as *aṣ-Ṣirãṭ* of the Day of Resurrection is the path which has to be followed either to Paradise or to Hell.

26. CHAPTER CONCERNING *AL-‘AQABÃT*

ash-Shaykh Abū Ja‘far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, says: "Our belief concerning this is that verily these mountain-passes (*al-‘aqabãt*) have each a specific name; some are called

farḍ (compulsory duty) others, *amr* (command); yet others, *nahy* (prohibition)."

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd says: "*al-ʻAqabãt* desinates the obligatory acts, the inquiry into their performance and the confrontation with them on the Day of Judgment. It does not mean mountains which exist on earth and which have to be ascended. They are acts which are likened to *al-ʻaqabãt* for the reason that, just as a man finds it hard and exhausting to climb a mountainpass (*ʻaqabah*), so also does he find the efforts which he makes to avoid shortcomings in his obedience to Allãh, the Sublime. Allãh, the Almighty, says: *Yet he has not assaulted the steep, and what shall teach what is the steep, the freeing of a slave* [90:11-13]. Thus He, the Exalted, names the acts which He has made compulsory for His servants '*ʻaqabãt*', likening them to steep roads and mountains because of the hardship a man suffers in order to perform them as if he were ascending a mountain road, difficult of access. The Commander of the Believers, peace be upon him, says: "In front of you lie difficult passes and dreadful stages through which one must pass and halt there; then you would either, by the grace of Allãh, be saved, or you would suffer irrevocable destruction". He meant by *ʻaqabah*, to get rid of responsibilities and obligations imposed upon men (by Allãh). Hence, this is far from what the Ḥashwiyyah maintain, that on the last day there will be mountains and steep roads which men must cross, either walking or riding; and this is nonsense if compared with the Divine purpose of retribution. Also, it is needless to create difficult passes to designate by each or poor-tax, or fasting, or pilgrimage or other obligatory acts which are to be ascended by men, so that if he falls short in his obedience to Allãh, this would prevent him from ascending them. The purpose of the Day of Judgment is to inquire into men's acts, and retribution for them either by reward or punishment, a fact which does not

require the naming of passes or creating mountains to be crossed with ease or difficulty. Moreover, no tradition has been handed down which supports such an allegation, or from which we can derive such an interpretation. Then as we have no support in traditions in this respect, the sound interpretation is the one put forward above.

27. THE BELIEF CONCERNING RECKONING AND BALANCE (*AL-ḤISÃB WA 'L-MĪZÃN*)

ash-Shaykh Abū Ja‘far says:[47], "Our belief concerning Reckoning is that it is true".

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd, may Allãh have mercy upon him, adds that: Reckoning is the balancing of actions and the requital, the examination of the servant on what he has done inadvertently, and recompensing him for his evil actions and praising him for good actions; and treating him in accordance with what he deserves. It cannot mean what the Orthodox (*lit.* the common folk – *al-‘Ãmmah*) maintain; that it is the setting of good actions against the base ones, and striking a balance between them in accordance with what reward or punishment each deserves, since *taḥãhuṭ*[48] (the mutual cancellation of good and evil deeds) is absurd; and the doctrine of the Mu‘tazilah in this respect is invalid and unconfirmed. Also, the Ḥashwiyyah claim as to its meaning are irrational.

al-Mawãzīn is the equating, "*ta‘dīl*", of the reward to its due place, and to ensure that each one receives what is his due. Then it is self-evident that the meaning of this is far from what the Ḥashwiyyah maintain, that on the Day of Resurrection there will be scales like the scales of this world, each with two pans into which works will be put, since actions are accidents, and accidents cannot be measured exactly, but can only be

described as heavy or light, metaphorically, which means that the heavy is what is abundant and deserves a high reward, and the light is what is of little worth and does not deserve a good reward.

The traditions which relate that the Commander of the Believers and the Imãms of his progeny, peace be upon them, are the scales, signify that they are the ones who will evaluate (men's) works and their due, and that they are the ones who will give judgment on them in justice and right. We say, "so-and-so for me is the worth (*fī mīzãn*) of so-and-so", which means that he is equal to him. And we say, "the speech of so-and-so is (*awzan*) than the speech of so-and-so", which means it is more excellent and held in greater esteem. What Allãh, the Sublime, says on Reckoning and the fear resulting from it, is that it is a man's confrontation with, and questioning on, his deeds, since he who is confronted with what he has done cannot escape from the consequences, and he whom Allãh, the Sublime, pardons will attain salvation. *Then he, whose scales are heavy* (with the great worth of his reward)*, they are the prosperous, and he whose scales are light,* (because his acts of obedience were few)*, they have lost their souls, abiding for ever in Hell* [23: 102-3].

Moreover, the Qur'ãn has been revealed in the language of the Arabs, whether in the real sense of the words, or in their metaphorical meaning, and has not been revealed in the vulgar tongue (and cannot be interpreted) according to the limited perception of vain minds.

28. CONCERNING PARADISE AND HELL (*AL -JANNAH WA 'N-NÃR*)

*Abū Jaʻfar says: "Our belief concerning Paradise is that it is the abode of eternity (*dãru 'l-baqã'*)*[49].

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd, may Allãh have mercy upon him, comments: Paradise is the abode of grace where weariness shall not touch its inmates, nor fatigue distress them; Allãh, the Exalted, set it up for those who knew and worshipped Him. Its grace is perpetual and shall never cease. The dwellers therein are of different ranks. Those who were perfectly devoted to Allãh, the Almighty, they will enter immune from the punishment of Allãh. And those who mingled good actions with base ones, and put off repentance continually, death shall cut them off before they achieve it, and then certain punishment will overtake them in their lifetime or after, or in this life alone; then they will dwell in Paradise after being forgiven by Allãh or punished. And among them there would be those who will receive the grace of Allãh by no previous action of their own in [this] world, these are the immortal youths (*al-wildãnu 'l-mukhalladūn*) whom Allãh, the Sublime, appointed for the service of the dwellers in Paradise to requite them for their good actions. They suffer neither hardship nor trouble in their service, since they are designed by nature to perform the demands of the believers. The reward of the dwellers in Paradise is to enjoy the delights of eating, drinking, pleasant scenes and marriage, and every pleasure of the senses to which their natural inclination leads them with which they will achieve their desires. Hence, in Paradise there is no human being who enjoys pleasure without eating, drinking, or gratification of the senses. The claim of him who alleges that in Paradise there are some who find pleasure in exalting and glorifying Allãh without enjoying food or drink is, in fact, foreign to the religion of Islam. It is an imitation of the Christians who allege that those who obey God in their lifetime will be transformed into angels who neither drink, nor eat, nor are married. Allãh, the Exalted, declares this assertion a lie in His Book, when He promises to those who do good, eating,

drinking, and marriage, and the Almighty says: *Its produce is eternal, and its shade. That is, the requital of the godfearing* [13:35]. And He, the Almighty, says: *Therein are rivers of sweet water* [47:15]. And He, the Exalted, says: *Houris, cloistered in pavilions* [55:72]. And He, the Sublime, says: *And wide-eyed houris* [56:22]. And He, the Exalted, says: *And We shall espouse them to wide-eyed houris* [44:54]. And He, the Almighty, says: *And with the maidens of equal age restraining their glances* [38:52]. And He, the Sublime, says: *Verily, the inmates of Paradise shall on that day be busy rejoicing, they and their spouses* [36:55-56]. And He, the Exalted says: . . . *that they shall be given in perfect semblance; and there for them shall be spouses purified; therein they shall dwell forever* [2:25].

How, then, do some hold it permissible to maintain that in Paradise there is a group of human beings who do not eat or drink, and that they take delight in what is an affliction to (the rest of) humanity, whereas the Book of Allãh disclaims this; and the consensus of opinion is against it, whether it is in imitation of some whom it is not permissible to imitate, or relying on spurious traditions.

As for Hell, it is the abode of those who have not known Allãh, the Exalted. Some of those who acknowledge Allãh may enter Hell because of their disobedience; but they will not abide therein eternally; rather, they will come out and enter perpetual grace, since none but the polytheists will reside therein forever. Allãh, the Sublime, says: *Now I have warned you of a Fire that flames, to which none but the most wretched shall be exposed* [92:14-15]. Here, 'shall be exposed to the Fire' means 'the eternal abiding therein'. Allãh, the Sublime says: *Surely those who disbelieve Our signs, We shall certainly expose them to a Fire* [4:56]. And He, the Almighty, says: *Verily, those who disbelieve even if they had what is in the earth, all of it with it, that they might ransom themselves with it*

from the punishment of the Day of Resurrection, it shall not be accepted from them . . . [5:36]. Thus, every verse which implies the meaning of eternal abiding in the Fire, concerns only the polytheists rather than those who acknowledge the existence of Allãh, the Almighty, according to the proofs of reason, and as supported (by the use) of the Book and the accepted traditions and the consensus of opinion, and the precedent current before the innovators amongst the followers of the doctrine of "threat"[50].

29. THE POINT OF UNBELIEF (*ḤADDU 'T -TAKFĪR*)[51]

Thus, it is not possible to maintain that he who is an unbeliever can know Allãh, or that he who believes in Him can be ignorant of Him. According to our principles, he who is an infidel is also ignorant of Allãh. Consequently, he who, though he be among the community of Islam, deviates from the principles of the faith, is, in our opinion, ignorant of Allãh, the Exalted, even if he professes the Unity of Allãh. As is also the case with those who do not believe in the Messenger of Allãh, even though there are amongst them some who profess the Unity of Allãh and behave in a fashion which might delude the weak into (believing) that they know Allãh. Allãh, the Almighty, says: *And whosoever believes in his Lord, he shall fear neither loss nor wrong* [72:13]; thereby He excludes the believers from the decrees binding on the infidels. Also, Allãh, the Almighty, says: *But no, by thy Lord! They will not believe till they make thee the judge regarding the disagreement between them* [4:65]. Thus, He denied faith to those who believe not in the Messenger of Allãh and because of their reservation in this matter, their knowledge of Allãh cannot be accepted. He, the Almighty, the Exalted, says: *Fight those who*

believe not in Allah and the Last Day . . . and they are in a state of subjection [9:29], whereby He denied faith to the Jews and the Christians, and relegated them to unbelief and error.

30. CONCERNING THE DESCENT OF REVELATION (*NUZŪLU 'L-WAḤY*)

ash-Shaykh Abū Ja'far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, says *on the descent of revelation that*[52], "Our belief concerning this is that there is a Tablet between the two eyes of Isrãfīl . . ."

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd, may Allãh have mercy upon him, says that Abū Ja'far depends in this matter on a *shãdhdh* tradition which is not generally accepted. Moreover, he has mentioned previously that the Tablet is an angel of Allãh, the Almighty.

Waḥy, originally, means a hushed speech; it might also bear the meaning of any speech which is intended to be understood by the hearer privately and by no one else, and directed at him and to no one else. But if it is applied to Allãh, the Sublime, then according to the usage of Islam and the law of the Prophet, peace be upon him and his progeny, it signifies what has been reserved for the messengers, peace be upon them, alone and is not given to others. Allãh, the Sublime, says: *So We revealed to Moses's mother, "Suckle him . . ."* [28:7]; thereupon Muslims unanimously agreed that the revelation in this case was a vision, or a speech addressed to and heard by Moses's mother alone, when she was asleep. And Allãh, the Sublime, says: *And thy Lord revealed unto the bees* [16:68], which means a secret illumination, since it is restricted to the bees, and the bees are acquainted with it without a speech proclaimed loudly by the speaker in order to be heard by others. And Allãh, the Sublime, says: *Surely the devils inspire their friends* [6:121], which means that they whisper to their friends through what

they introduce into their inmost hearing, by which means they inform privatley without telling it abroad. And He, the Exalted, says: *He came forth unto his people from the sanctuary and inspired them* [19:11], which means that he commanded them without the utterance of words. He likened this (i.e., his signal to them) to revelation in being hidden from others and secret from them. Allãh, the Exalted, (might give illumination to many of His creatures in their dreams, the interpretation of which may be proved sound and their truth established, yet they cannot be specified as revelation, since the *sharī'ah* has been settled once and for all. Also, it is not permissible to say of those who are inspired with the knowledge of something that Allãh has revealed it to them. Also (according to our tenets) Allãh, the Almighty might inspire the proofs after His Prophet, peace be upon him and his progeny, with speech which descends to them, revealing what will be, but still it cannot be called revelation for the reasons given above, which confirms that the general consensus of the learned Muslims is that no revelation can descend on anyone after our Prophet, may Allãh bless him and his progeny and grant him salvation. Therefore, none of these things which we mentioned can be called a revelation to anyone, since it is for Allãh, the Exalted, to permit the use of the term at one time and forbid it at another, sometimes to prohibit it and to allow it to others. As for its significance, it never departs from its true meaning as given above.

CHAPTER: As for the revelation from Allãh, the Most High, to His Messenger, may Allãh bless him and his progeny, it was conveyed to him, sometimes without an intermediary, and sometimes from the lips of the angels who transmitted it to him. What Abū Ja'far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, has mentioned concerning the Tablet and the Pen, and what he confirmed on this matter, has only one tradition supporting it. Yet we do not

rely on it, nor do we affirm its authenticity, and we testify only to that which we know, since the tradition is not *mutawãtir*, nor is it confirmed by the consensus of opinion, nor does the Qur'ãn proclaim it, nor is it established by a Proof (an imãm) of Allãh, the Almighty, that it would be considered tenable. And the best course is to reserve judgment on it, and to allow it without affirming it or declaring it sound definitively, and keep it within the bounds of possibility. As for the certainty with which Abū Jaʿfar affirms it and his belief in it, this is nothing but blind imitation, and far be it from us to imitate (anything) blindly.

31. ON THE REVELATION OF THE QUR'ÃN (*NUZŪLU 'L-QUR'ÃN*)

ash-Shaykh Abū Jaʿfar, may Allãh have mercy upon him, says that: "The Qur'ãn was sent down in one lot, in the month of Ramaḍãn, on the Night of Power (*laylatu 'l-qadr*), (first) to al-Baytu 'l-Maʿmūr (the ever-prosperous house). And then it was revealed in the space of twenty years . . ."

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd says that: What Abū Jaʿfar, may Allãh have mercy upon him, maintains in this respect, originally derives from an *aḥãd* tradition which is not a fit basis, either for doctrine or for practice. Moreover, the revelation of the Qur'ãn piecemeal, as need arose, bears witness to the contrary, since it includes the description of what had happened and the narration of what was past, and this indeed indicates that it was only revealed as need arose. Do you not realize the speech of Allãh, the Exalted: *And for their saying, "Our hearts are uncircumcised", nay, but Allãh sealed them for their unbelief* [4:155]. And His saying: *They say, "Had the All-merciful so willed, we would not have served them", They have no knowledge of that* [43:20]. This involves information about the past which requires that the narrator should not precede it, since this involves giving

information about something past, which has not yet happened – indeed, is still in the future. There are many such instances in the Qur’ãn, one of which is the narration of *ẓihãr*[53], and the reason for it; when a woman complained to the Prophet, may Allãh bless him and his progeny, about the judgment on it, Allãh, the Exalted, revealed: *Allãh has heard the words of her that disputes with thee* [58:l]. Now this is an incident that happened at Medina; then how can we say that Allãh, the Exalted, revealed it at Mecca before the emigration took place and thus state that it happened when in fact it had not.

Moreover, if we look at the accounts reported in the Qur’ãn, then we would come across many instances similar to that which we have mentioned, and which will take us beyond the scope of our discussion. Thus, what we have mentioned is sufficient for men of perception. In fact, the tradition resembles the doctrine of the anthropomorphists, who claim that the Qur’ãn is the eternal words of Allãh, the Praised, the Exalted, and that it relates the future as if it were the past; their teaching has been refuted by the adherents of Allãh's Unity (by the assertors of the Unity of Allãh – *ahlu 't-tawḥīd)* in the manner demonstrated above.

The tradition that the Qur’ãn was revealed 'all of a piece' on the Night of Power, may bear another interpretattion, that 'a piece of it' (*jumlatun minhu*) was revealed on the Night of Power, then the rest of what has been revealed until the death of the Prophet, may Allãh bless him and his progeny, followed this. But that it has been revealed as a whole and altogether on the Night of Power is a notion which is far from what the plain meaning of the Qur’ãn teaches, and is in contrast to the *mutawãtir* traditions and the consensus of the learned divines, irrespective of their different inferences.

CHAPTER: As for the meaning of the speech of the Almighty Allah: *And hasten not* (O Muḥammad) *with the Qur’ãn ere its*

revelation is accomplished unto thee [20:114], there are two proper interpretations for it other than that mentioned by Abū Ja'far, which he derived from a *shãdhdh* tradition. The first is that Allãh, the Exalted, forbids him (Muḥammad) to be hasty in the interpretation of what has been revealed to him in accordance with the rules of the language of the Arabs, though it may be permissible, and the second is that the Prophet, may Allãh bless him and his progeny, used to follow Jibrīl in his recitation, word by word, hence, Allãh, the Exalted, commanded him not to do so, but to hearken to what was brought to him by Jibrīl, or to what was sent down to him without intermediary till it came to an end: and when the revelation was completed, to recite it and give it utterance and declare it.

Thus, the interpretation put forward by him who relies on the tradition (mentioned above) is far from the truth, since there is no reason to maintain that Allãh, the Exalted, has commanded him not to be hasty with the Qur'an which is in the fourth heaven until it is revealed to him wholly, since he possesses no knowledge about what there is in the fourth heaven before it is revealed to him. It is also meaningless to restrain him from what is beyond his powers, except if one claims that he possessed full knowledge of the Qur'ãn which is in the fourth heaven; then, by assuming this, his argument and position collapses, because he has maintained that the Qur'ãn is originally in the (fourth) heaven; and since what is in the breast of the Messenger of Allãh, may Allãh bless him and his progeny, and in its preservation on the earth, then it is absurd that it should be confined to the heavens. Moreover, if what is in the preservation (i.e., memory) of the Messenger of Allãh, may Allãh bless him and his progeny, is described as being in the fourth heaven, then what is in the preservation of others should be described the same way; then it cannot be ascribed to the fourth heaven, nor, still less, to the first, in preference to the

fourth. Thus, he who considers what we have said would realize that the interpretation of the verse by him who relied on the tradition is far from the truth.

32. THE BELIEF ON IMPECCABILITY (*AL-'IṢMAH*)

*Abū Ja'far says: "Chapter on the belief on *al-'iṣmah* (impeccability)"*[54].

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd, may Allãh have mercy upon him, says: The impeccability granted by Allãh to His Proofs is the succour and grace by which the Proofs keep themselves free from sin and error in the religion of Allãh, the Exalted. The impeccability, in fact, is a grace granted by Allãh, the Exalted, to him whom He knows will hold fast by it. Hence, freedom from sin is the action of him who maintains himself free from sin, and this freedom from sin does not involve being prevented from committing a base act, nor does it oblige or compel him who possesses it to act righteously; rather it is a thing which Allãh, the Exalted, knows that if He bestows it upon one of His slaves, no trace of fault will be found in him. Yet, this privilege is not bestowed freely upon all men, rather it is restricted to those who are the chosen and the best. Allãh, the Exalted, says: *But as for those unto whom, already, the reward most fair has gone forth from Us, they shall be kept far from it* (Hell) [21:101]. And He, the Praised, says: *Certainly We chose them, out of a knowledge, above all beings* [44:32]. And He, the Exalted, says: *And in Our sight they are, indeed, of the chosen, the excellent* [38:47].

(Also, we are of the opinion) that the Prophet and the Imãms after them are free from sin during their prophethood and imãmate, whether major or minor. It is arguable that they might omit a supererogatory act, yet without intending to commit a disobedience thereby. It is inconceivable that they should omit

an obligatory act either before or after their imãmate.

CHAPTER: And whenever perfection is attributed to them in their different states of life, it implies their perfection in all states in which they were Proofs of Allãh to His creatures.

It has been related that the Messenger of Allãh, may the blessing and peace of Allãh be upon him and his progeny, and the Imãms from his progeny after him were entitled to be the Proofs of Allãh, the Exalted, from the time when they achieved years of discretion until Allãh took them. Yet, even before they attained the age of religious responsibility, they were not subject to defects and ignorance since they were of the pattern of Jesus and John, peace be upon them, in that they were endowed with perfection though they were still children, and had not attained the age of discretion. And, in fact, this is a tenable proposition, one which admits of rational proof. Besides that, there is no justification for declaring false the traditions in this respect: at any rate it is necessary only to maintain their perfection, peace be on them, in knowledge and impeccability during their prophet-hood and imãmate, and to hold a non-committal attitude regarding their careers before that, whether it was a state of prophet-hood and imãmate or not, and to affirm that impeccability is inevitable from the time Allãh, the Sublime, brings them to full discretion till He, the Almighty, makes them (peace be upon them) die.

33. CHAPTER ON EXCESS AND DELEGATION (*AL-GHULUWW WA 'T-TAFWĪḌ*)

Abū Jaʿfar says: "Chapter concerning the denial of Excess and Delegation".

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd says: 'Excess' (*al-ghuluww*)[55], linguistically means 'exceeding the limit and turning aside from the true goal'. Allãh, the Almighty, says: *O, People of the Book!*

Do not exaggerate in your religion, nor utter aught concerning Allãh save the truth [4:171]. Hence, He forbade exceeding the limits concerning the belief in the Messiah, and warned against turning aside from the true goal in speech, and declared the Christians' claims about him excess, since they went beyond the limit, as we have explained. The Extremists (al-Ghulãt) among those who outwardly profess Islam, are those who attribute divinity and prophethood to the Commander of the Believers and Imãms of his progeny, peace be upon them, and ascribe to them privileges concerning their status in this world and the world to come, by which they go beyond the limit and turn aside from the goal; hence they are evil-doers and infidels whom the Commander of the Believers *has sentenced to death, and the stake;*[56] also the Imãms, peace be upon them, have branded them with unbelief and departing from the pale of Islam.

CHAPTER: As for what Abū Ja'far mentions of the death of our Prophet and the Imãms by poison or murder, some of this is confirmed as fact and some not. What is confirmed is that the Commander of the Believers, al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, peace be upon them, departed from this world by murder, none of them died a natural death. Mūsã ibn Ja'far, peace be upon him, was killed by poison. It is highly probable that ar-Riḍã ('Alī ibn Mūsã) was poisoned, yet this cannot be confirmed. As for the others, there is no justification for the claim that they were either poisoned or murdered or killed through persecution, since the reports concerning this matter are extremely confused, and there are no means of proving it definitely.

The adherents of the doctrine of delegation (al-Mufawwiḍah)[57] are a group of extremists who are distinguished from the others by their peculiar claim that though the Imãms are created, originated beings, and not eternal, yet they ascribe to them creation and sustaining. Also, they maintained that Allãh, the

Exalted, created them and ceased to create, delegating to them the creation of the world and what lay therein.

As for the Ḥallãjiyyah, they are a certain group of Ṣūfīs, the adherents of the doctrine of licentiousness (*ibãḥah*) and incarnation (*al-ḥulūl*)[58]. al-Ḥallãj[59] outwardly claimed to be a Shī'ah, yet he, in fact, was a Ṣūfī. The Ḥallãjiyyah are, indeed, heretics and *zindīq*s, appearing to each sect as if they were of their persuasion, and claiming impossible powers for al-Ḥallãj, as the fire-worshippers used to ascribe miracles to Zoroaster, and the Christians who attribute miracles and wonders to their monks. Yet, fire-worshippers and Christians are nearer to fulfilling duties than they are, and, indeed, they are further removed from the observance and practice of the law than are the fire-worshippers and the Christians.

CHAPTER: As for the claim of Abū Ja'far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, that he who accuses the learned divines of Qum of attributing to the Imãms less than their due, should be stigmatized as an extremist. In fact, the charging of this group with such attribution is not a sign of excess, since amongst those who are mentioned as learned divines and scholars, there are many who accuse the bona fide scholars of attributing less than their due to the Imãms, be they from Qum or from any other country or any other people.

We have heard a narration, the meaning of which is plain, related to the authority of Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Walīd"[60], may Allãh have mercy upon him, and the interpretation in favour of *taqṣīr* is inescapable. This is what is related on his authority: "The first degree of excess is to deny that the Prophet and the Imãms were ever fallible (*sahw*)", Then if this was indeed related by him, he in fact attributes less than their due to the Imãms, and yet he is one of the divines of Qum. Moreover, we found a group of the divines of Qum who

openly and firmly made this attribution in their belief, and they were degrading the Imãms from their proper ranks, and alleging that they were ignorant of many of the religious ordinances until they received illumination. Also, we saw that many of them claim that they (the Imãms), apply religious law according to their personal opinion and suppositions, and yet they claim that they are divines and this indeed, is attributing to the Imãms less than their due.

Indeed, it is a sufficient sign of excess to claim that the Imãms are not created beings, and that they are divine and eternal, since the only logical conclusion of this assertion is excess; that the Imãms are the creators of bodies, originators of substances, and bring into existence accidents which are beyond human power. We need no more than this to judge or to ascertain their position without the signs which Abū Ja‘far, holds the marks of excess.

34. ON DISSIMULATION (*AT-TAQIYYAH*)

*Abū Ja‘far says: "Chapter concerning *at-taqiyyah*"*[61]. ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd adds: Dissimulation is disguising the truth and concealing belief therein, reticence in the face of one's opponents and refraining from divulging to them that which might result in injury to one's religious or worldly welfare. It is obligatory only when injury is absolutely certain, or the presumption of it is very strong. But if it was not certain or obvious that harm would result from disclosing the truth, nor was the presumption strong, then dissimulation is not obligatory.

The truthful ones, (the Imãms), peace be upon them, have ordered a certain group of their followers not only to refrain and cease from demonstrating the truth, but also to veil and conceal it from the enemies of the religion, and to appear to

them in such a way as to dispel their doubts during their disputation with them, since this was in their best interest; whereas they commanded another group of their followers to dispute with their opponents and divulge their true doctrine to them, and invite them to embrace the truth, since they knew that no harm would befall them. Hence, dissimulation is obligatory in the cases we have put forward; whereas the obligation is removed in other cases, as we have demonstrated above.

Moreover, Abū Jaʿfar has summarized the subject matter, and has not discussed it in detail as we have done. Also, he convicts himself by what he has said on the subject; since he himself has omitted an obligatory act in this respect, and stands condemned by his own words. This is so because he has disclosed his doctrine and the truth in which he believes in his famous audiences and the discussions conducted there, which were well-publicised, and his compilations which enjoyed a wide circulation; yet he has not realized the contradiction between his words and deeds. Then, had he discussed the matter fittingly as should have been done, and bridled his tongue in his discussions of these things, he would have been saved from self-contradiction; then the truth would have been made plain to those who seek the truth, and they would not have been confronted with difficulties, nor would doubts have obscured the meaning of the subject. But he did as the traditionists do in following the apparent meaning of the words, and abandoning critical methods. This is a view which vitiates the religion of him who holds it and prevents him from achieving fair-mindedness.

35. THAT THE ANCESTORS OF THE PROPHET WERE MONOTHEISTS (*MUWAḤḤIDŪN*)

Abū Jaʿfar says: "Our belief concerning the ancestors of the

Prophet, may the blessing of Allãh be upon him and his progeny, is that they were Muslims".

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd adds that: The ancestors of the Prophet, may the blessing of Allãh be upon him and his progeny, as far as Adam, peace be upon him, were monotheists (*muwaḥḥidūn*) and believers in Allãh, as has been demonstrated by Abū Ja‘far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, and the consensus of opinion of the adherents of the truth. Allãh, the Exalted, says: *Who sees thee when thou standest, and when thou turnest about among those who prostrate themselves* [26:218-9], which means his transmission through the loins of the monotheists. His Prophet, may the blessing of Allãh be upon him and his progeny, says: "I was transmitted from the loins of the pure to the wombs of the chaste till Allãh, the Exalted, brought me forth in this world of yours," which demonstrates that his ancestors were all believers, since had there been an unbeliever amongst them, then they would not merit the description 'pure', for Allãh, the Exalted, says: *The polytheists are indeed unclean* [9:28]. Hence, He stigmatized the unbelievers are unclean. Consequently, when the Messenger of Allãh, may the blessing of Allãh be upon him and his progeny, affirmed that his ancestors were all chaste and so described them, he confirmed that they were believers.

36. CONCERNING THE INTERPRETATION OF THE VERSE: *SAY* (O MUḤAMMAD, UNTO MANKIND): *"I ASK YOU NO REQUITAL THEREOF"*

Abū Ja‘far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, says that Allãh, the Exalted, has ordained a requital for His Prophet, may the blessing of Allãh be upon him and his progeny, for his apostleship and guidance of mankind's devotion to his *Ahlu 'l-Bayt*, peace be upon them. Then, he adduces in evidence of this the speech of Allãh: *Say* (O Muḥammad, unto mankind): *"I ask you no requital*

for this, save loving-kindness towards (my) *kinsfolk"* [42:23].

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd, may Allãh have mercy upon him, comments that it is not true that Allãh, the Exalted, has made the requital of His Prophet men's devotion to his *Ahlu 'l-Bayt*, peace be upon them, nor that He made this a part of his reward. For the reward of the Prophet, may the blessing of Allãh be upon him and his progeny, for his devotion to Him is perpetual grace. It is this with which Allãh, the Exalted, out of His justice, generosity and bounty, has bound Himself to recompense him. For the rewarding of a deed is not owed to men as the act should be devoted sincerely to Allãh alone, and that which is Allah's is to be rewarded from Allãh alone, and none save Him. Further, Allãh, the Exalted, says: *"And, O my people! I do not ask of you wealth for this; my wage rests with Allãh alone"* [11:29]. He also says: *"O my people! I do not ask of you a wage for this; my wage falls only upon Him Who did originate me"* [ibid.:51].

Then, if the requital was in accordance with what Abū Ja'far presumed about the meaning of the verse, then the Qur'ãn would have contradicted itself, since the verse would have to be rendered like this – 'I do not ask you a wage, but I do ask of you a wage'. And also – 'My wage is with Allãh alone, but rather my wage is with Allãh as well as with others than Him'. And this is impossible since the text of the Qur'ãn cannot bear this meaning.

If then, it happened that someone said: "Then what is the meaning of 'I do not ask of you a wage for this, save loving-kindness towards (my) kinsfolk'? Does it not mean that He asked of them devotion towards his Prophet's progeny in return for what he has done for them?", then we would have to say that the facts are now what you have presumed them to be; since the proof of reason and of the Qur'ãn refute it, as we domonstrated above.

The axceptive (*istithnã'*) in this particular place is not part of the main sentence because it refers to something distinct from the main clause; 'I do not ask of you a return for this, but I ask and oblige you to show devotion towards kinsfolk'. Then His speech, "I do not ask of you a return for this", is an independent sentence complete in itself; while His speech (only I demand of you) "loving-kindness towards kinsfolk" forms a new sentence signifying, "but I do ask of you devotion to (my) kinsfolk". This is similar to His saying: *Then the angels bowed themselves all together, save Iblīs* [15:30-31], which means, "whereas Iblīs (did not)"; hence it is not an exceptive clause dependent on the preceding. And His saying: *They are an enemy to me, except the Lord of all beings* [26:77], which means, 'but the Lord of all beings is not an enemy of mine'. The poet says:

A land in which there is no companion,
but the gazelles and the piebald camels.

Then the meaning of his verse, 'A land in which there is no companion', is a self-sufficient sentence, complete in itself, while the verse, 'but the gazelles . . .' being a new sentence, means 'but there are gazelles and piebald camels in it'.

This is clear and has no obscurity for anyone with any knowledge of language, and it is too well-known to linguists to require elucidation.

37. ON PROHIBITION AND PERMISSION
(*AL-ḤAẒR WA 'L-IBÃḤAH*)

Abū Ja‘far says, concerning prohibition and permission, that "Everything is permitted . . ."

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd says: Things according to the dictates of reason fall into two categories; the first, those which are conceived as prohibited by reason, these are the things which

reason abhors and admonishes against, such as injustice, foolishness and vanity. The second are those which are not defined by reason as either forbidden or lawful but only by textual proof (*samʻ*). This group includes deeds, the performance of which may corrupt on one occasion and be beneficial on another, and they are restricted to the rulings of canon law, which have suffered abrogation and amendment. Since, however the religious law is settled once and for all, the general decision is that: Everything that is not prohibited by *naṣṣ* (i.e., the specific ordinances of religion) is permitted, because the religious canon has laid down the limits of the law, and distinguished finally what is prohibited, so it follows logically that what lies outside their scope is permitted.

38. ON MEDICINE (*AṬ-ṬIB*)

Abū Jaʻfar says: "Our belief concerning the reports on medicine . . ."

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd, may Allãh have mercy upon him, says: Medicine is a proper science, and a discipline approved by revelation; the scholars took their knowledge of it from the prophets. For there is no means of diagnosing illness except by textual proof, and no means of telling the remedy except by what is prescribed. Thus, it has been established that the way to know this is by textual proof (*samʻ*) from Him Who knows the secret essence of things, or by reports which have been handed down on the authority of the truthful Imãms, exemplified in the saying of the Commander of the Believers, "The stomach is the seat of every desease, and diet is the principal medicine, so let everyone keep his body to what he is accustomed to".

Also, a remedy which might prove useful to the people of one district, might prove fatal to the people of another, and a medicine

might benefit a people of a certain habit which would not help those of another. The truthful Imãms would prescribe for one of the sick people a medicine which proved to be harmful to others suffering from the same complaint, without harming him, since they were aware that the cause of the illness (in the first case) had ceased; so he who uses this medicine, uses it after recovery without being conscious of this. In fact, their knowledge of this was inspired by Allãh, the Almighty, in the manner of a miracle and as a supernatural proof of their distinctive status. Thus, some people presumed that when the medicine combined with the germs of the illness, it would benefit them; and this they were greatly mistaken and injured others. However, this is a consideration which Abū Ja‘far has not mentioned, though it is relevant to this chapter. As for the interpretations put forward by him, they are quite sound; the traditions may bear the meaning which he mentioned.

39. ON THE DIVERGENT TRADITIONS (*AL -AḤÃDĪTHU 'L-MUKHTALIFAH*)

Abū Ja‘far says on the divergent traditions . . .

ash-Shaykh al-Mufīd, may Allãh have mercy upon him, comments that Abū Ja‘far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, did not explain the method of ascertaining which tradition is to be followed as binding precedent in jurisprudence, and which is not. In fact, he gives only a brief account of this, notwithstanding the need for a detailed examination to discriminate between what must be followed and what not, and for scrutinizing everyone of them, to tell the true tradition from the spurious, and what he has established in his summary is insufficient. We have discussed the divergence of the traditions and explained the difference between the sound and the spurious, the true and the false, and what is binding precedent and what is to be disregarded, and

that which agrees in content, although the wording differs, and that which stems from prudent fear (*at-taqiyyah*) and that where the meaning is the same as that expressed. All this is set out in our books and compilations in such a way as to dispel any doubt for those who will consult them, and grace is of Allãh, the Almighty. He who wants to comprehend this subject should consult our book entitled *at-Tamhīd,* and that entitled *Maṣãbīḥu 'n-nūr*. Also, the responses (given) to our followers throughout the world. In brief, not every tradition ascribed to the truthful Imãms does, in fact, derive from them, since patent absurdities are ascribed to them (with others). Consequently, he who has not mastered this science cannot distinguish the true from the false.

Thus, different expressions have been related on their authority, of which the meanings are identical though they differ in expression. This difference is due to the fact that they deal with both the specific and the general (*al-khãṣṣ wa 'l-'ãmm*), and the supererogatory and the obligatory; so, also, some deal with particular points on which the decision cannot be applied to other cases, and still others are worded metaphorically, out of prudent fear and cautious behaviour. Each of these categories has its own inferences and its own proofs, and grace is of Allãh, the Exalted.

However, these general considerations can be elaborated when we classify the divergent traditions accuretly, as we have discussed above, and determined the meaning of them in the manner we described.

Thus, the false tradition, however many author-ities are given for it, does not circulate as widely as the genuine which has been related on the authority of the Imãms, peace be upon them. And what has been related on their authority which is delivered out of expediency, is not related frequently on their authority like the one which is acted upon, since one of the two inevitably is given preference over the other, if the chain of the

authority is scrutinized closely. Moreover, our companions have not agreed unanimously either upon what is delivered because of expediency or upon what has been adulterated (*tadlīs*), or forged, or what has been put in their mouth falsely, or deceitfully ascribed to them.

Then, (as a general rule), when we find that one of the two traditions has been accepted as genuine and binding precedent, then it is that which is sound in both its exoteric and esoteric meanings, whereas the second one is not feasible, either because it has been said from prudence or it has been adulterated. And, if we find a tradition related on the authority of ten of the followers of the Imãms, peace be upon them, differs from another in both expression and meaning, and if it is impossible to reconcile the two, we should prefer the one related by ten to that related by two or three authorities; and we should consider that which is sustained only by a few as being delivered from prudence, or else that its transmitter has deluded himself. And, if we find that a particular tradition has been put into practice repeatedly by chosen companions of the Imãms, peace be upon them, continuously and in the lifetime of one Imãm after another, then we should inevitably prefer it to a tradition which others sustain, and which differs from it, provided that it has not been strengthened by other chains or put into practice. And, if we find a tradition related on the authority of the learned divines of the group (i.e., the Shī‘ah) and they have not testified to anything which differs from it, we consider the first to be sound; even if the latter has been related on others' authority, they are not comparable in number or distinction to the Imãms, as are the first, since this (i.e., closeness to the Imãms) is the sign of veracity and the distinction between true and false. It is indeed unlikely that the Imãms, peace be upon them, should deliver an opinion (responsum) dictated by prudence (*at-taqiyyah*) in a certain case, and that this should be heard by the learned divines among their companions without their having any

knowledge of its true interpretation, since, even if this escaped one, it would not escape all, as they were well-versed in delivering response, and the limits of what is lawful and what is prohibited, what is obligatory and what is supererogatory, and the general ordinances of religion.

Above all, whenever we find a tradition differing from the text of the Book (Qur'ãn) and it cannot be reconciled with it, we discard it as the Book and the consensus of the Imãms' dictate, and so, if we find a tradition contradicts the rules of reason, we discard it, as reason declares it corrupt; yet we judge either that it is sound and has been delivered from prudence or false and has been ascribed to the Imãms, so we content ourselves with mentioning it, and admitting it in the light of the various kinds of expediency accepted as lawful by the *sharī'ah* and that which it proscribes, or those the current usage sanctions or denies.

This is part of the general rule which has been described in detail, and which (if applied) will show the truth in divergent traditions; yet the final judgment cannot be established before specifying the divergent traditions and applying the rules appropriate in each case, as we have explained. As for the tradition which Abū Ja'far, may Allãh have mercy upon him, relies on, and which has been mentioned in the book attributed to Sulaym[62], on the authority of Abãn ibn Abī 'Ayyãsh, the (general) meaning of it is sound, yet none the less, the book is unauthoritative and most of it cannot be accepted as binding precedent, since it has suffered corruption and adulteration; therefore the scrupulous should abandon all that it contains, and not rely on the greater part of it, or imitate its narrator, but enquire of the learned divines, to distinguish for him the sound from the spurious. And Allãh is He Who guides to the truth.

* * * * *

NOTES

PART TWO

[1] Not found in N.

[2] See al-Maydãnī, *Majma'u 'l-amthãl*, vol.2, p.47; cf., az-Zamakhsharī, *al-Kashshãf*, vol.3, p.210; ar-Rãzī, *Tafsīr*, vol.8, p.203.

[3] T, *laysa hadhã huwa 'l-wajh fi 't-tafsīr*: N, *laysa huwa 'l-wajh.*

[4] See al-Maydãnī, op. cit., vol.2, p.248.

[5] T, *'an jazãi 'l-af'ãl*: N, *al-jazã' 'ala 'l-af'ãl*, which is correct.

[6] T, *falammã kãnati 'l-mujãzã*: N, *falammã kãnati 'l-af'ãli 'l-mujãzã*, which is correct.

[7] N reads only: *Faṣlun fī ṣifãti 'dh-dhãt wa ṣifãti 'l-af'ãl.*

[8] T, *fathabatati 'l-'ibrah*: N, *fathabatati 'l-ghayriyyah*.

[9] N, *qãla Abū Ja'far* . . . (without ash-Shaykh).

[10] See p.89.

[11] Prof. Nicholson gives the following explanation for the word *zaddīq*:

"*Zaddīq* is an Aramaic word meaning 'righteous'. Its etymological equivalent in Arabic is *ṣiddīq*, which has a different meaning, namely 'veracious'. *Zaddīq* passed into Persian in the form *zandīk,* which was used by the Persians before Islam, and *zindīq* is the Arabicised form of the latter word". See *A Literary History of the Arabs*, p.375. Also, cf., Prof. Browne's *A Literary History of Persia,* (vol.1, pp.159-60). This interpretation, however, is not accepted by some scholars like Prof. Massignon, L., see *E.I,* vo1.4, put out a new and non-orthodox explanation (*zand*) of the Avesta, and which p.1228. "Under the Sasanids, originally, this name branded anyone who dared was then applied to Manicheans and Mazdakites in particular". See Brockelman, C., *History of the Islamic Peoples,* Eng. Transl., p.113. "In Islam, it denotes", says Prof, Tritton, "a Manichee, any Dualist, a Buddist Monk and, later on, any free-thinker". See *Islam, Belief and Practices*, The Glossary, p.190. The movement during the second part of the second century of the *hijrah* represented both a religious and political danger to Islam, which compelled Islam to combat

it, politically by practical measures carried out by the government itself, and theologically, in the form of an intellectual revolt against dualist ideas in religion; this was left for the Mu‘tazilah who represented – as the late Michelangelo Guidi observed, "The militant wing of the orthodoxy against the dualist heresies". See Gibb, H.A.R., *Studies on the Civilization of Islam*, article no.4, 'The Social Significance of the Shuubiya', p.67. For a similar opinion, see al-Khayyãṭ, *Kitãbu 'l-Intisãr*, the Introduction by the Editor, Nyberg, H.S.

[12] See p.98.

[13] * * Not found in N.

[14] N reads: *fīmã dhakara Abū Ja‘far fi 'l-qaḍã' wa 'l-qadr, qãla raḥimahu Allãh* . . .

[15] N reads: *lã yaṣluḥu bihi ãkharūn.*

[16] * * Not found in N.

[17] * * Not found in N.

[18] **Zurãrah ibn A‘yan ash-Shaybãnī (d. 150 AH):** It is said that his real name was ‘Abdu Rabbih, whereas Zurãrah was his *laqab*. His *kunyah* was Abu '1-Ḥasan. He was one of the earliest distinguished Shī‘ah divines and a remarkable theologian, jurist and traditionist. His father, Sunsun, is said to have been a Roman slave who was freed for his knowledge of the Qur'ãn, and his grandfather is said to have become a Christian Monk. He was highly honoured by Imãm Ja‘far aṣ-Ṣãdiq (a.s.), who said of him: "Had it not been for Zurãrah, the traditions of my father would have been forgotten". The biographers ascribe to him, among other works, a theological tract called *al Jabr wa 'l-istiṭã‘ah.* See Ibnu 'n-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p.220; aṭ-Ṭūsī, *Rijãli 'sh-Shī‘ah,* p.123; al-Kishshī, *ar-Rijãl*, p.88; an-Najãshī, *al-Fihrist*, p.125, adh-Dhahabī, *Mīzãnu 'l-i‘tidãl,* vol.2, p.69, no.2853; al-Mãmaqãnī, *Tanqīhu 'l-maqãl*, vol.l, p.438, no.4213.

[19] The Shī‘ah theologians call themselves *al-Khãṣṣah,* whereas they denote by *al-‘Ãmmah* the Sunnites generally.

[20] See al-Bukhãrī, *aṣ-Ṣaḥīḥ*, *tafsīr* of *sūrah* 30; Muslim, *aṣ-Ṣaḥīḥ*, *Kitãbu 'l-Qadar*, Tradition no.22.

[21] **Ismã‘īl ibn Ja‘far aṣ-Ṣãdiq:** The eldest son of the sixth Imãm, His father at first nominated him as his successor to the imãmate, but later on deposed him from this position because of his excessive addiction to drink. Though he died five years before his father at Medina in 143/760-1, and though his body was publicly exposed and his death attested to by numerous witnesses, many among his followers held that he survived his father and ascribed to him many miraculous acts. The Seveners (*as-*

Sab'iyyah), that is, the Ismã'īliyyah sect of the Shī'ah, with its various offshoots, derives its name from him. See al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'ãzu 'l-ḥunafã'*, vol.l, p.16; Ibnu '1-Jawzī, *Talbīs Iblīs,* p.102; an-Nawbakhtī, *Firaqu 'sh-Shī'ah*, p.35; ash-Shahristãnī, *al-Milal*, vol.2, p.5; Lewis, B., *The* Origins *of Ismã'īlism*, p.38; *E.I.,* the article "Ismã'īl ibn Ja'far", by Huart, C.H., vol.2, i, p.549.

[This view has been quoted from the non-Imãmite sources, but for the right opinion concerning Ismã'īl and his life history see our "Introduction" to the English translation of *Kitãb al-Irshãd* which will be published by the Will of Allãh (ed.).]

22 **Muḥammad ibn Ya'qūb ibn Isḥãq al-Kulaynī ar-Rãzī:** He is known as Abū Ja'far, the compiler of the great compendium of Shī'ite traditions, *al-Kãfī fī 'ilmi 'd-dīn,* which occupies in Shī'ism a position analogous with that of the *Ṣaḥīḥ*, of al-Bukhãrī among the Sunnīs. It was his life-work and took twenty years to compile. He is called, in recognition of his diligence in collecting Shī'ite traditions, the Trustworthy authority of Islam "Thiqatu 'l-Islãm", (In respect to Thiqatu 'l-Islãm al-Kulaynī and the book of *al-Kãfī*, see our two introductions to the English translation of *al-Kãfī* at the beginning of the "The Book of Reason and Ignorance" [ed.])

al-Kulaynī was born porbably before 260/847, and died in Baghdad in Sha'bãn, 329 AH (May, 941 AD). For a critical and detailed account of his life and work see Ivanow, W., *The Alleged Founder of Ismã'īlīsm*, pp.ll-27. Also, the "Introduction" to the new edition of *al-Kãfī* by Dr. Ḥusayn 'Alī Maḥfūẓ (Tehran, 1381 AH). an-Najãshī, op. cit. p.266; aṭ-Ṭūsī, op. cit., p.495; al-Mãmaqãnī, op. cit., vol.3, p.211, no.11540.

23 **Yūnus ibn Ya'qūb ibn Qays:** His *kunyah* was Abū 'Alī al-Jallãb. He was contemporary with both aṣ-Ṣãdiq, the sixth Imãm, and his son, al-Kãẓim (a.s.). He was highly esteemed by the Shī'ah for his profound knowledge of *fiqh.* The Shī'ah biographers honour him for being the author of a book on pilgrimage, which is counted among the Four Hundred Principle Books. He died during the imãmate of the Eighth Imãm, 'Alī ibn Mūsã ar-Riḍã (203/ 818). See an-Najãshī, op. cit., p.311; al-Kishshī, op. cit., p.245; aṭ-Ṭūsī, op. cit., p.335; al-Mãmaqãnī, op. cit., vo1.3, p.344, no.13365.

24 For more detail concerning this debate, see al-Kulaynī, *al-Kãfī,* vol.l , p.171; al-Mãmaqãnī, op. cit., vol.l, p.371.

25 **Ḥumrãn ibn A'yan ash-Shaybãnī:** His *kunyah* is variously reported as Abu '1-Ḥasan or Abū Ḥamzah. He was a distinguished traditionist and jurist. He was contemporary with both Imãms, al-Bãqir and aṣ-Ṣãdiq (a.s.), and was highly respected by the latter, of whom it is reported that he said:

"Ḥumrãn is one of our company both in this world and the world hereafter". He also promised him paradise for his intimacy with the Family of the Prophet, and his staunch defence of the Shīʻah tenets. Opinions differ concerning his trustworthiness, thus, while the Shīʻah authorities generally praised him and accepted him as a reliable transmitter, the orthodox were split; some discarded his reports, others accepted them as genuine and reliable. See al-Kishshī, op. cit., p.117; aṭ-Ṭūsī, op. cit., p.117; al-Mãmaqãnī, op. cit., vol.l, pp.370-2, no.3351; adh-Dhahabī, *Mīzãnu 'l-i'tidãl*, vol.1, p.604, no.2292; Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhību 't-tahdhīb*, vo1.3, p.25, no.32; Ibnu 'n-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p.220.

26 **Muḥammad ibn ʻAbdillãh ibn aṭ-Ṭayyãr:** A follower of the Fifth Imãm Muḥammad al-Bãqir (a.s.). He was known as a dialectic theologian and a reciter of the Qur'ãn. See al-Kishshī, op. cit., pp.222-3; aṭ-Ṭūsī, op. cit., pp.135-292; al-Mãmaqãnī, op. cit., vol.3, p.134, no.10895.

27 See *al-Kãfī*, "Introduction" to "The Book of Divine Unity", (Eng. transl.), published by WOFIS, Tehran.

28 **Qays al-Mãṣir:** The famous Shīʻah theologian and traditionist, who lived during the first half of the second century of the *hijrah.* He was an intimate associate of the Fourth Imãm, ʻAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn (d. 92/710-1), from whom, it is said, he acquired skill in disputation. He relates many traditions on the authority of aṣ-Ṣãdiq (a.s.). See al-Mãmaqãnī, op. cit., vol.2, p.33, no.9728; al-ʻÃmilī, *Aʻyãnu 'sh-Shīʻah*, vol.l, pt.2, p.77.

29 See *al-Kãfī*, "Introduction" to "The Book of Divne Unity", (Eng. transl.), published by WOFIS, Tehran.

30 **Muḥammad ibn Ḥakīm al-Kathʻamī:** His *kunyah* was Abū Jaʻfar. He was associated with both aṣ-Ṣãdiq and his son al-Kãẓim (a.s.). See aṭ-Ṭūsī, op. cit., p.316; an-Najãshī, op. cit., p.205; al-Mãmaqãnī, op. cit., vo1.3, p.109, no.10624.

31 See p.92.

32 al-Kulaynī, *al-Kãfī*, "Bãbu 't-Taqlīd", vol.l, p.53.

33 T, *ḥamalat jamīʻi 'l-khalq*: N, *jumlat jamīʻi 'l-khalq*. Prof. Fyzee (*A Shīʻite Creed*, Note no.lll) reads *jumlat* for *ḥamalat*. However, *ḥamalat* is more in keeping with the chapter and what is generally held by the Shīʻah traditionists, concerning *al-ʻArsh*. See al-Ashʻarī, *Maqãlatu 'l-Islãmiyyīn*, vol.l, p.35.

34 N reads, *qãla ash-Shaykh Abū ʻAbdillãh ʻalayhi 'r-raḥmah*, *amma 'n-nafs* . . .

[35] See al-Bukhãrī, *aṣ-Ṣaḥīḥ*, "Kitãbu 'l-Anbiyã'", "Bãbu 'l-arwãḥ junūd mujannadah", no.1; Muslim, *aṣ-Ṣaḥīḥ*, "Kitãbu 'l-birr wa 'ṣ-ṣilah wa 'l-ãdãb". Tradition no.159.

[36] **Nawãṣib:** An appelation used by the Shī'ah to designate those who refuse any pre-eminence to 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭãlib (a.s.), sometimes applied to the orthodox indiscriminately. Friedlaender, I., says that "Originally, Nawãṣib stood for the exact reverse of Rawãfiḍ: the 'enemies' or 'haters' of 'Alī, and was confined to the extreme Khãrijites. Gradually, its meaning expanded so that it finally embraced all the Sunnites, however far they were from hating 'Alī." (*The Heterodoxies of the Shī'ites in the Presentation of Ibn Ḥazm*, vol.2, p.156). See also, Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisãnu 'l-'Arab*, vol.l, p.762.

[37] T, *shana'a bihi 'n Nãṣibah*; N, *mã shana'a . . .*

[38] * * Not found in N.

[39] See Ibn Hishãm, *as-Sīrah*, Eng. transl. by Guillaume, A., p.306.

[40] *Ḥarbu 'l-Baṣrah*, also called *Ḥarbu 'l-Jamal*, because 'Ãishah, the wife of the Prophet, was mounting a camel, around which the battle was concentrated. *Ḥarbu 'l-Jamal* was the first civil war in Islam which took place between Amīru '1-Mu'minīn, 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭãlib (a.s.), and Ṭalḥah ibn 'Ubaydillãh, az-Zubayr ibn al-'Awwãm and 'Ãishah. See aṭ-Ṭabarī, *at-Tãrīkh*, vol.1, pt.6, p.3078; Ibnu '1-Athīr, *al-Kãmil*, vol.3, p.165; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidãyah*, vol.7, p.229; al-Maqdisī, *al-Bad' wa 't-tãrīkh*, vol.5, p.211.

[41] **Ka'b ibn Sūr:** (It is written 'Sūrah' which is a mistake.) A companion, who was sent by 'Umar as a judge to Baṣrah. He is known to be a man of extreme piety who would pray thoughout the night and fast the whole day; thereupon, his wife complained of him to the Caliph who ordered him to be moderate in his worship and observe his family obligations. It is reported that he was one of those who refrained from fighting in the early stages of the Battle of Camel (*i'tazala 'l fitnah*) and shut himself inside a cottage; later on, under the pressure of 'Ãishah, he came out displaying his Qur'ãn in an effort to make peace between the two camps, but was shot down by a stray arrow. See Ibn Sa'd, *aṭ-Ṭabaqãt*, vol.7, p.65.

[Ka'b ibn Sūr was not a companion of the Holy Prophet, and he had not heard anything from the Holy Prophet or met him. He was only a *tãbi'ī.* See Ibn 'Abdi '1-Barr, *al-Istī'ãb*, vol.3, pp.1318-9; Ibnu 'l-Athīr, *Usdu 'l-ghãbah*, vol.4, pp.242-3; Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Iṣãbah*, vol.3, pp.314-5. Ibn Sa'd mentions him as a *tãbi'ī* from Baṣrah who was the companion of 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭãb (ed.)]

[42] * * Not found in N.

[43] * * Not found in N.

[44] T, *wa ta‘abbuduhum bidhãlika liyuthībahum ‘alayhã* – N, *wa 't-ta‘abbudu bidhãlika liyuthībahum ‘ala 'l-a‘mãli 'l-latī yuadduna biha 't-taklīf kamã ta‘abbada 'l-bashar wa 'l-jinn bi 'l-a‘mãl liyuthībahum ‘alayhã . . .*

[45] See al-Kulaynī, *al-Kãfī*, vol.l, p.218, Tradition nos.l & 2. Also, al-Mufīd, *al-Ikhtiṣãṣ*, p.303.

[46] * * Not found in N.

[47] * * Not found in N.

[48] For the meaning of *taḥãbuṭ*, see Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisãnu 'l-‘Arab*, vol.6, p.270; ar-Rãzī, *at-Tafsīr*, vol.2, p.220; al-Jurjãnī, *Sharḥu 'l-mawãqif*, vol.2, p.488.

[49] * * Not found in N.

[50] This is one of the five principal tenets of the Mu‘tazilah. See al-Khayyãṭ, *al Intiṣãr*, p.126; al-Ash‘arī, op. cit., vol.l, p.278.

[51] ***Ḥadd*:** Literally means to restrain from, *al-man‘*. In jurisprudence it means the restrictive ordinances of the religious law of Islam. See al-Jurjãnī, *at-Ta‘rīfãt*, p.57; Ibn Manẓūr, op. cit., vol.3, p.142.

[52] * * Not found in N.

[53] ***Ẓihãr*:** Putting away the wife by saying: "Thou art to me as the back of my mother:" This concerned Khawlah bint Mãlik ibn Tha‘labah, who was divorced by her husband. Aws ibn Ṣãmit, with this form of words, current among the Arabs of the *jãhiliyyah* but forbidden in Islam by this verse, The penance for it is the freeing of a slave, the feeding of sixty poor or two months successive fast. For a detailed discussion, see Ibnu '1-‘Arabī, *Aḥkãmu 'l-Qur’ãn*, vol.4, p.1734; al-Qãsimī, *Maḥãsinu 't-ta’wī1*, vol.16, p.5706.

[54] * * Not found in N.

[55] **al-Ghuluww:** The technical term for the ultra-Shī‘ah groups. "Originally, it seems to have had", as Friedlaender observed, "a wider range and to have been applied to other than Shī‘ite movements", (op. cit., p.12). ‘Alī burnt* several of certain groups of them who publicly proclaimed his divinity. ash-Shahristãnī says that the innovations of the extremists can be restricted to four: Anthropomorphism (*at-tashbīh, al-badã’*, i.e., mutability of Allãh's Will), *ar-raj‘ah* (the return) and *at-tanãsukh*, transmigration or reincarnation, (*al-Milal*, vo1.2, p.11). See also *Lisãnu 'l-‘Arab*, vol.l5, p.132; an-Nawbakhtī, *Firaqu 'sh-Shī‘ah*, p.35; al-Ash‘arī, op. cit., vol.l, p.16; Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Fiṣal*, vol.4, p.186; Ibnu 'l-Jawzī, *Talbīs Iblīs*, p.99; at-Tahãnawī, *Kashshãf iṣṭilãḥãti 'l-funūn*, vol.2, p.1099.

*[What has come to us in the Shī‘ite Traditions Amīru '1-Mu’minīn, peace be upon him, has not killed them by burning but they were suffocated by

an overwhelming sour fumes. What has been narrated by the translator was quoted from the Sunnī sources (ed.).]

[56] T, *ḥakama fīhim Amīru 'l Mu'minīn bi 'l-qatl wa 't-taḥrīq bi 'n-nãr. . .*; N, *ḥakama fīhim Amīru 'l-Mu'minīn bi 'l-kufr.*

[57] **al-Mufawwiḍah:** A group which maintains that Allãh created Muḥammad, peace be upon him and his progeny, (some add 'Alī, peace be upon him), then He committed to him (or to them) the management of the world and the disposal of its affairs. Then Muḥammad, peace be upon him and his progeny, entrusted the rule of the universe to 'Alī and the Imãms, peace be upon them, after him. According to Friedlaender, "At the bottom of this idea lies the Gnostic discrimination between the 'unoriginated, inconceivable Father' and the word (Logos) emanating from him which is Demiurge", op. cit., p.92; see also al-Baghdãdī, *al-Firaq*, p.237; al-Ash'arī, op. cit., p.16; Ibnu '1-Jawzī, op. cit., p.98; Ibn Ḥazm, op. cit., vol.4, p.179.

[58] **al-Ḥulūliyyah:** A group who derive their name from the doctrine of incarnation, *ḥulūl*, and incorporation, *imtizãj*. They held that it is possible and permissible for Allãh to become incarnated in man's body. Most of them have, also, an inclination to a relaxed attitude towards religious obligations prescribed by the Divine Law. The Ḥulūlīs are often mentioned as followers of and related to al-Ḥallãj; nevertheless, al-Hujwīrī denies this relation and says that, "In the compositions of al-Ḥallãj himself there is nothing but profound theosophy" (al-Hujwīrī, *Kashfu 'l-maḥjūb*, Eng. transl. by Prof. Nicholson, R.A., p.260). See al-Baghdãdī, op. cit., p.241; al-Ash'arī, op. cit., pp.13-14; Ibnu '1-Jawzī, op. cit., p.171 ; Friedlaender, L, op. cit., vol.2, p.12; at-Tahãnawī, op. cit., vol.1, p.352.

[59] **Abu '1-Mughīth al-Ḥusayn ibn Manṣūr ibn Maḥãmã al-Bayḍãwī:** A Persian mystic and theologian. His grandfather is said to have been a magician. He was born in 244/858 at at-Tūr near al-Bayḍã (Fãrs). He was accused of being charlatan by the Mu'tazilah, ex-communicated by a *tawqī'* of the Imãmiyyah and a *fatwã* of the Ẓãhiriyyah, and twice arrested by the 'Abbãsid police (*E.I.*, the article, "al-Ḥallãj", by Massignon, L.). "The Ṣūfī *shaykh*s", says al-Hujwīrī, "are at variance concerning him. Some reject him, while others accept him. Others suspended their judgment about him" (op. cit., p.150). He was executed by crucifixion after a trial on Tuesday, 24th Dhi 'l-Qi'dah, 309 AH (26th March, 922 AD), during the caliphate of al-Muqtadir, because in one of his ecstasies he had cried out "I am the Truth". "al-Ḥallãj", says al-Hujwīrī, "was the author of brilliant compositions and allegories and polished sayings in theology and jurisprudence" (op. cit., p.151). See Ibnu 'n-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, pp.190-2;

Ibn Khallikãn, op. cit., vol.l, p.183; adh-Dhahabī, *Mīzãnu 'l-i‘tidãl*, vol.l, p.548; Browne, E.G., *A Literary History of Persia*, vol.l, p.428; Nicholson, R.A., *A Literary History of the Arabs,* p.399.

60 **Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Aḥmad ibn al-Walīd:** He is known as Abū Ja‘far al-Qummī (d. 343 AH), was a celebrated traditionist, a jurist of high reputation and the spritual head of the Qummī divines. He was accepted by the traditionists as a trustworthy and realiable transmitter. He was the *shaykh* of Ibn Bãbawayh al-Qummī. See an-Najãshī, op. cit., p.271; aṭ-Ṭūsī, op. cit., p.495; al-Mãmaqãnī, op.cit., vol.3, p.100, no.10534.

61 * * Not found in N.

62 **Sulaym ibn Qays al-Hilãlī al-‘Ãmirī al-Kūfī:** His *kunyah* was Abū Ṣãdiq. He was accused by al-Ḥajjãj for his Shī‘ite learnings, a charge which made him go into hiding. He was a companion of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭãlib and known as a man of piety. It is said that his face was illuminated by his piety. It is also said that he handed over the traditions entrusted to him by ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭãlib to Abãn ibn Abī ‘Ayyãsh as a mark of gratitude for granting him a refuge. See aṭ-Ṭūsī, op. cit., p.43; al-Kishshī, op. cit., p.68; al-Mãmaqãnī, op. cit., vol.2, p.52, no.5157; Ibnu 'n-Nadīm, op. cit., p.219.

* * * * *

BIBLIOGRAPHY

and

INDEXES

BIBLIOGRAPHY

‘ABDULLÃH, ASH-SHAYKH, *Falãsifatu 'sh-Shī‘ah*, (n.p.or d.).

AL-AMĪN, Muḥsin, al-‘Ãmilī, *A‘yãnu 'sh-Shī‘ah*, Beirut, 1380/ 1960.

ARNOLD, Sir Thomas, *The Caliphate,* Oxford, 1924.

AL-ASH‘ARĪ, *Maqalãtu 'l-Islãmiyyīn wa ikhtilãfi 'l-muṣallīn*, edited by H. Ritter, Istanbul, 1929 (2 vols. with continuous pagination).

AL-BAGHDÃDĪ, ‘Abdu 'l-Qãhir ibn Ṭãhir, *al-Farq bayna 'l-firaq wa bayãna 'l-firqatu 'n-nãjiyah minhã*, edited by Muḥammad Badr, Cairo, 1910. Translation of the first half of *al-Firaq,* under the title *Muslim Schism and Sects*, by Kate Chamers Seeley, Columbia University Press, 1919. Translation of the second part by Dr. Abraham S. Halkin, Tel Aviv, 1935.

BROCKELMANN, C., *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, Berlin, 1898-1902. Arabic translation under the title, *Tãrīkhu 'l-adabi 'l-‘Arabī*, by an-Najjãr, Cairo, 1962.

— *Geschichte der Islamischen Volker*, Eng. transl., under the title, *History of the Islamic Peoples*, by Joel Carmichael and Mosche Perlmann, 1959 (Fifth Impression).

BROWN, E. G., *A Literary History of Persia*, (4 vols), Cambridge, 1928.

AL-BUKHÃRĪ, *al-Jãmi‘u 'ṣ-ṣaḥīḥ*, Leiden, 1862 (3 vols.).

ADH-DHAHABĪ, *Mīzãnu 'l-i‘tidãl fī naqḍi 'r-rijãl,* new edition by ‘Alī Muḥammad al-Bajjãwī, Cairo, 1382/1962.

DONALDSON, D. M., *The Shī'ite Religion*, London, 1933.

AD-DŪRĪ, 'Abdu 'l-'Azīz, *Dirãsãt fi 'l-'uṣūri 'l-'Abbãsiyyah al-muta'akh-khirah*, Baghdad, 1945.

Encyclopaedia of Islam (*E.I.*):-
Article on "Buwayhids" by C. Brockelmann.
Article on "Ḥallãj" by L. Massignon.
Article on "Ismã'īl ibn Ja'far" by C. H. Huart.
Article on "al-Mufīd" by (?).

FRIEDLAENDER, I., *The Heterodoxies of the Shī'ites in the Presentation of Ibn Ḥazm*, New Haven, 1909.

FYZEE, A.A.A., *A Shī'ite Creed*, A translation of *I'tiqãdãtu 'l-Imãmiyyah* of Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Bãbawayh al-Qummī (ash-Shaykhu 'ṣ-Ṣadūq), published for the Islamic Research Association, India, 1942, Revised edition published by World Organization for Islamic Services (WOFIS), Tehran, 1982/1402.

GIBB, H.A.R., *Mohammadanism*, ed., 1952.

— *Studies on the Civilization of Islam*, London, 1961.

GOLDZIHER, I, *Vorlesungen über den Islam*, Arabic translation, under the title, *al-'Aqīdah wa 'sh-sharī'ah fi 'l-Islãm,* by Muḥammad Yūsuf Mūsã, 'Alī 'Abdi 'l-Qãdir, Cairo, 1379/1959.

ḤASAN IBRÃHĪM ḤASAN, *Tãrīkhu 'l-Islãmi 's-siyãsī*, (3 vols.), Cairo, 1953-8.

HOLISTER, J. N., *The Shī'a of India*, London, 1953.

AL-HUJWĪRĪ, *Kashfu 'l-maḥjūb*, English translation, by R. A. Nicholson, London, 1936.

IBN 'ABDI 'L-BARR, *al-Istī'ãb fī ma'rifati 'l-aṣḥãb*, Hyderabad, 1318/1900, and Egypt edition, (4 vols.), (n.d.).

IBNU 'L-'ARABĪ, al-Qãḍī, Abū Bakr; *Aḥkãmu 'l-Qur'ãn*, edited by al-Bajjãwī, Cairo, 1957-8.

IBNU 'L-ATHĪR, Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Alī, *al-Kãmil fi 't-tãrīkh*, ed. Tumgerg, Leiden, 1867.

— *Usdu 'l-ghãbah*, Egypt, (5 vols.), (n.d.).

IBN ḤAJAR AL-ASQALÃNĪ, *al-Iṣãbah*, Egypt, (4 vols.), 1328 AH.

— *Lisãnu 'l-mīzãn*, Hyderabad, 1329/1911.

— *Tahdhību 't-tahdhīb,* Hyderabad, 1325-7/1907-9.

IBN ḤAZM, Abū Muḥammad, ʻAlī ibn Aḥmad, *al-Fiṣal fi 'l-milal wa 'l-ahwã' wa 'n-niḥal*, (5 vols. in two), Cairo: al-Adabiyyah, 1317-20 H.

IBN HISHÃM, *as-Sīrah (an-Nabawiyyah)*, English translation by A. Guilaume, Oxford, 1955.

IBNU 'L-JAWZĪ, Abu 'l-Faraj, ʻAbdu 'r-Raḥmãn ibn Aḥmad, *al-Muntaẓim fī tãrīkhi 'l-mulūk wa 'l-umam*, Hyderabad: Dãiratu 'l-Maʻãrifi 'l-ʻUthmãniyyah, 1358 H.

— *Talbīs Iblīs*, Cairo, 1928.

IBN KATHĪR, Abu 'l-Fidã', Ismãʻīl ibn ʻUmar, *al-Bidãyah wa 'n-nihãyah*, Cairo, 1351/1932.

IBN KHALDŪN, Abū Zayd, ʻAbdu 'r-Raḥmãn ibn Muḥammad, *al-Muqaddimah*, Beirut, 1906.

IBN KHALLIKÃN, Abu 'l-ʻAbbãs Aḥmad, *Wafayãtu 'l-aʻyãn,* 1310 H.

IBN MANẒŪR, Abu 'l-Faḍl, *Lisãnu 'l-ʻArab*, Beirut, 1955-6.

IBNU 'L-MURTAḌÃ, Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyã, *al-Munyah wa 'l-amal*, edited by Arnold, Sir Thomas, Hyderabad, 1316 AH.

IBNU 'N-NADĪM, Abu 'l-Faraj, Muḥammad ibn Yaʻqūb, *al-Fihrist*, edited by Gustav Flügel, Leipzig, 1871.

IBN SAʻD, Abū ʻAbdillãh Muḥammad, *aṭ-Ṭabaqãtu 'l-kabīr*, edited by Edward Sachau, Leiden: Brill, 1917.

IBN SHAHRÃSHŪB, Muḥammad ibn ʻAlī al-Mãzandarãnī, *Maʻãlimu 'l-ʻulamã'*, edited by ʻAbbãs Iqbãl, Tehran, 1353/ 1934.

IBN TAGHRĪ BIRDĪ, *an-Nujūmu 'z-zãhirah fī mulük Miṣrã wa 'l-Qãhirah*, Cairo, 1358/1908.

IBN TAYMIYYAH, *Majmūʻãtu 'r-rasãil wa 'l-masãil,* edited with notes by Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍã, Cairo, 1341-9/1922-30.

IVANOW, W., *The Alleged Founder of Ismailism*, (Ibnu '1-Qaddãḥ), Ismaili Soc., Ser. A. I., Bombay, 1946.

AL-JURJÃNĪ, ʻAlī ibn Muḥammad, as-Sayyid ash-Sharīf, *Sharḥu '1-mawãqif lil ʻAllãmah ʻAḍudu 'd-Dīn ʻAbdu 'r-Raḥmãn ibn Aḥmad*

al-Ījī, Istambul: Dãru 'ṭ-Ṭibã‘i 'l-‘Amīrah, 1292 H.
— *at-Ta‘rīfãt*, (n.p.or d.).

AL-KHAṬĪB AL-BAGHDÃDĪ, *Tãrīkh Baghdãd*, Cairo: al-Khãnjī, 1349/1931.
AL-KHAYYÃṬ, Abu 'l-Ḥusayn, ‘Abdu 'r-Raḥmãn ibn ‘Uthmãn, *Kitãbu 'l-Intiṣãr,* edited with introduction by H. S. Nyberg, Beirut, 1957.
AL-KHUḌARI, *Muḥãḍarãt fī tãrīkhi 'l-umami 'l-Islãmiyyah*, (n.p.or d.).
AL-KHWÃNSÃRĪ, Muḥammad Bãqir, *Rawḍãtu 'l-jannãt fī aḥwãli 'l-‘ulamã' wa 's-sãdãt*, Tehran, Lith. 1367 H.
AL-KISHSHĪ, Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar ibn ‘Abdi 'l-‘Azīz, *Ma‘rifat akhbãri 'r-rijãl*, Bombay, 1317 AH.
AL-KULAYNĪ, Abū Ja‘far, Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qūb ibn Isḥãq ar-Rãzī, *al-Kãfī fī ‘ilmi 'd-dīn*, new edition, Tehran, 1381 AH.

LEWIS, B., *The Origins of Ismã'īlism*, Cambridge, 1940.

AL-MAJLISĪ, Muḥammad Bãqir, *Biḥãru 'l-anwãr*, edited by M. H. aṭ-Ṭabãṭabã'ī, Tehran, 1376/1957.
AL-MÃMAQÃNĪ, *Tanqīḥu 'l-maqãl fī aḥwãli 'r-rijãl*, 3 vols., an-Najaf al-Ashraf, [Iraq], 1352 AH.
AL-MAQDISĪ, Muṭahhar ibn Ṭãhir, *al-Bad' wa 't-tãrīkh*, edited by C. Huart, Paris, 1899/1919.
AL-MAQDISĪ, Shamsu 'd-Dīn, *Aḥsanu 't-taqãsīm fī ma‘rifati 'l-aqãlīm*, edited by De Goeje, Leiden, 1877.
AL-MAQRĪZĪ, Taqiyyu 'd-Dīn, Abu 'l-‘Abbãs, Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Abdi 'l-Qãdir al-Miṣrī al-Ḥanafī, *Itti‘ãẓu 'l-ḥunafã' bi akhbãri 'l-aimmati 'l-khulafã'*, edited by Jamãlu 'd-Dīn ash-Shayyãl, Cairo, 1948.
— *al-Khiṭaṭ*, Būlãq (Cairo), 1270 AH.
AL-MAYDÃNĪ, Abu 'l-Faḍl, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad, *Majma‘u 'l-amthãl*, 2 vols., Cairo, 1310 AH.
MEZ, Adam, *The Renaissance of Islam,* Eng. transl., by Khuda Bukhsh and Margoliouth, London, 1937. Arabic transl. under the title *al-Ḥaḍãratu 'l-Islãmiyyah fi 'l-qarni 'r-rãbi‘ al-hijrī,* by Abū Rīdah, Cairo, (n.d.).

AL-MUFĪD, ASH-SHAYKH, Abū ‘Abdillãh, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn an-Nu‘mãn al-Ḥãrithī, Ibnu 'l-Mu‘allim, *Ajwibatu 'l-masãili 's-saghãniyyah*, an-Najaf al-Ashraf, al-Ḥakīm Library, MS. no. 442, fol. 14.

— *al-Ikhtiṣãṣ*, edited by ‘Alī Akbãr al-Ghaffãrī, Tehran, 1379 AH.

— *Kitãb al-Irshãd,* Eng. transl., by I. K. A., Howard, London, 1981.

MUSLIM, Ibnu '1-Ḥajjãj, *al-Jãmi'u 'ṣ-ṣaḥīḥ*, with the commentary of an-Nawãwī, Istanbul, 1329 AH.

AN-NAJÃSHĪ, Abū ‘Abbãs, Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī, *Kitãbu 'r-Rijãl*, (*al-Fihrist*), Bombay, 1317/1899.

AN-NAWBAKHTĪ, Abū Muḥammad, al-Ḥasan ibn Mūsã, *Firaqu 'sh-Shī‘ah*, edited by H. Ritter, Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1931.

NICHOLSON, R. A., *A Literary History of the Arabs*, Cambridge, 1961.

AL-QÃSIMĪ, Jamãlu 'd-Dīn, *Maḥãsinu 't-ta’wīl*, edited by Fuãd ‘Abdi '1-Bãqī, Cairo, 1957.

AR-RÃZĪ, Fakhru 'd-Dīn, *Mafãtīḥu 'l-ghayb* (*Tafsīr*), (8 vols.), Cairo, 1309/1890-1.

AṢ-ṢAFADĪ, Ṣalãḥu 'd-Dīn, Khalīl ibn Aybak ibn ‘Abdillãh, *al-Wãfī bi 'l-wafayãt*. Edited by H. Ritter, Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1931.

ASH-SHAHRISTÃNĪ, ‘Abdu 'l-Karīm, *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal,* on the margin of Ibn Ḥazm's *al-Fiṣal.* Also, the new edition by Aḥmad Fahmī Muḥammad, Cairo, 1948.

SULAYMÃN DUNYÃ, *Muḥammad ‘Abduh bayna 'l-falãsifah wa 'l-mutakallimīn*, Muḥammad ‘Abduh's commentary on ad-Dawãnī's commentary on *al-Mawãqif,* of al-Ījī, (2 vols.) with continuous pagination, Cairo, 1377/ 1958.

AS-SUYŪṬĪ, Jalãlu 'd-Dīn, *Tabaqãtu 'l-mufassirīn,* Ludg. Bat., 1839.

— *Tãrīkhu 'l-khulafã’*, Delhi, 1309/1891, English translation by H. S. Jarrett, Calcutta, 1881.

AṬ-ṬABARĪ, Abū Ja‘far, *Tãrīkhu 'r-rusul wa 'l-mulūk,* edited by De Goeje, Lugd. Bat., 1901.

AT-TAHÃNAWĪ, *Kashshãf iṣṭilãḥãti 'l-funūn,* edited by Mawlawī Muḥammad Wajīh, 'Abdu '1-Ḥaqq and Ghulãm Qãdir, under the superintendence of Dr. A. Sprenger and W. Less, Calicutta, 1862.
TRITTON, A.S., *Islam, Belief and Practices*, Hutchinson University Library, London,1957.
AṬ-ṬŪSĪ, Abū Ja'far, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, (Shaykhu 'ṭ-Ṭãifah), *Fihrist Rijãli 'sh-Shī'ah*, edited by Baḥru '1-'Ulūm, an-Najaf al-Ashraf, 1381/1961.

WATT, W. M., *Islamic Philosophhy and Theology,* Islamic Surveys, no.l, Edinburg, 1962.

YÃQŪT AL-ḤAMAWĪ, *Mu'jamu '1-buldãn*, 5 vols., Beirut, 1957.
— *Mu'jamu '1-udabã'*, (n.p.or d.).

AZ-ZAMAKHSHARĪ, *al-Kashshãf 'an haqãiqi 't-tanzīl*, Būlãq, 1318 AH.

* * * * *

INDEXES

A. QUR'ÃNIC VERSES

B. NAMES AND TITLES

C. TECHNICAL TERMS